arXiv:1305.0122v1 [nlin.SI] 1 May 2013

Algebro-geometric solutions and their reductions for the Fokas-Lenells hierarchy

Peng Zhao Engui Fan* Yu Hou

School of Mathematical Sciences, Institute of Mathematics
and Key Laboratory of Mathematics for Nonlinear Science,
Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, P.R. China

Abstract

This paper is dedicated to provide theta function representations of algebro-geometric solutions for the Fokas-Lenells (FL) hierarchy through studying an algebro-geometric initial value problem. Further, we reduce these solutions into N-dark solutions through the degeneration of associated Riemann surfaces.

1 Introduction

In the past few decades, the celebrated nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equation has been widely studied. By using bi-Hamiltionian methods, Fokas proposed an integrable generalization of the NLS equation, known as Fokas-Lenells equation [5]

$$q_{xt} - q_{xx} - i|q|^2 q_x - 2iq_x + q = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

or coupled form

$$\begin{cases} q_{xt} - q_{xx} + iqq_x r - 2iq_x + q = 0, \\ r_{xt} - r_{xx} - iqrr_x + 2ir_x + r = 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where q, r is a complex-valued function of x and t. Just like the bi-Hamiltionian structure of the well-known Korteweg-de Vries equation can be perturbed to yield the integrable Camassa-Holm equation, the same mathematical trick to the two Hamiltionian operators associated withe the NLS equation yields the FL equation. In the context of nonlinear optics, the FL equation models the propagation of nonlinear light pulses in monomode optical fibers when certain higher-oder nonlinear effects are taken into account [16].

---

*Corresponding author and e-mail address: faneg@fudan.edu.cn

The FL equation is a completely integrable nonlinear partial differential equation possessing Lax pair, bi-Hamiltonian structure, and soliton solutions [5, 16, 17, 18]. One of the remarkable feature of the FL equation is that it possesses various kinds of exact solutions such as solitons, breathers, etc.. It is known that the bright solitons under vanishing boundary condition have been constructed by inverse scattering transform (IST) method [17], dressing method [18] and Hirota method [21]. The lattice representation and the N-dark solitons of the FL equation have been presented in [25], where a relationship is also established between the FL equation and other integrable models including the NLS equation, the Merola-Ragnisco-Tu equations and the Ablowitz-Ladik equation. In [22], Matsuno has dealt with a more sophisticated problem on the dark soliton solutions with a plane wave boundary condition using Hirota method. The breather solutions of the FL equation have also been constructed via a dressing-B*ä*cklund transformation related to the Riemann-Hilbert problem formulation of the inverse scattering theory [26]. Recently, n-order rogue waves solutions of FL equation has been investigated using Darboux transformation method [8] . Another feature of the FL equation is that it describes the first negative flow of the integrable hierarchy associated with the derivative nonlinear Schr*ö*dinger (DNLS) equation [5, 12, 13, 16].

To begin with, we give a few remarks about the FL equation. Strictly speaking, the Fokas-Lenell equation has three different but closely related forms. The original equation obtained by Forkas is [5]

$$iu_t - \nu u_{tx} + \gamma u_x x + \sigma |u|^2 (u + i\nu u_x) = 0,\ \sigma = \pm 1,\ x \in \mathbb{R},\ t > 0, \tag{1.3}$$

where ν, γ, ρ are real parameters and $u = u(x,t)$ is a complex-valued function. The transformation [17]

$$u \to \beta\sqrt{\alpha} e^{i\beta x} u,\ \alpha = \gamma/\nu,\ \beta = 1/\nu,$$

changes (1.3) into

$$u_{tx} + \alpha\beta^2 u - 2i\alpha\beta u_x - \alpha u_{xx} + \sigma i \alpha\beta^2 |u|^2 u_x = 0,\ \sigma = \pm 1, \tag{1.4}$$

which is equivalent to (1.1). Equation (1.2) is transformed into

$$u_{\tau\xi} = u - i\sigma |u|^2 u_\xi,\ \sigma = \pm 1 \tag{1.5}$$

through the transformations

$$\begin{aligned}&u \to \sqrt{a}be^{i(bx+2abt)}u,\ a = \gamma/\nu > 0,\\ &\xi = x + at,\ \tau = -ab^2t.\end{aligned}$$

Equation (1.5) is the so-called Forkas-Lenells derivative nonlinear Schrӧdinger in some references [22, 25]. Therefore, we will not distinguish these three equations from each other since the existence of these simple transformations among them.

The algebro-geometric or quasi-periodic solution, parameterized by the Jacobi variety of a algebraic curve, is a kind of important solutions in soliton theory. This kind of solutions was originally studied on the KdV equation based on the inverse spectral theory. The algebro-geometric method has developed by pioneers such as the authors in [1, 3, 4, 11, 15, 19, 23] and further developed by the authors in [2, 6, 14, 24]. In a degenerated case of the algebro-geometric solution, the multi-soliton solution and periodic solution in elliptic function type may be obtained [3].

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the algebro-geometric solutions and dark soliton solutions of the FL hierarchy using the algebro-geometric method [7]. This systematic approach, proposed by Gesztesy and Holden to construct algebro-geometric solutions for whole integrable hierarchy, has been extended to the (1+1) dimensional integrable hierarchy, such as the AKNS hierarchy, the CH hierarchy etc. Recently, we investigated algebro-geometric solutions for the the Degasperis-Procesi hierarchy and Hunter-Saxton hierarchy [9, 10].

In the present paper, we consider a cauchy problem (4.1), (4.2) of FL hierarchy with a quasi-periodic initial condition q, r (cf. (3.71), (3.72)) and search for its solutions. We will prove the solution of this cauchy problem is unique (cf. Lemma 4.3) and give the explicit form of q, r (cf. Theorem 4.6). We find that the quasi-periodic solutions obtained in Theorem 4.6 can be linked with the dark solitons of FL hierarchy. Especially, for the FL equation (1.2), the results of [25, 26] can be partly contained from a different standpoint. It is worth notice that our results in the present paper can not applied to analyze the N-bright soliton of the FL equation since these two kinds of soliton belong to different boundary conditions and its may be discussed in detail elsewhere if necessary.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we construct the FL hierarchy using a zero-curvature approach and a polynomial recursion formalism. As a byproduct, we give the conservation law of this newly established hierarchy. Moreover, the hyperelliptic curve $\mathcal{K}_n$ of genus n associated with the FL zero-curvature pairs is introduced with the help of the characteristic polynomial of Lax matrix $V_{\underline{n}}$ for the stationary FL hierarchy. In section 3, we treat the stationary FL hierarchy and its quasi-periodic solutions. Using these stationary quasi-periodic solutions as initial values, we solve the cauchy problem and obtain the quasi-periodic solutions of FL hierarchy in section 4. In section 5, we consider a certain limit of these algebro-geometric solutions to reduce them into the dark solitons of the FL hierarchy.

2 The Fokas-Lenells Hierarchy, Recursion Relations, and Hyperelliptic Curves

In this section, we provide the construction of HS hierarchy and derive the corresponding sequence of zero-curvature pairs using a polynomial recursion formalism. As a byproduct, we obtain the first conservation law of the FL hierarchy. Moreover, we introduce the underlying hyperelliptic curve in connection with the stationary FL hierarchy.

Throughout this section, we make the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2.1. *In the stationary case we assume that*

$$q, r \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}), \quad q(x), q_x(x), r_x(x) \neq 0,\, x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.1}$$

In the time-dependent case we suppose

$$\begin{aligned} & q(\cdot,t), r(\cdot,t) \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}), t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad q(x,\cdot), r(x,\cdot) \in C^{1}(\mathbb{R}), x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ & q(x,t), q_x(x,t), r_x(x,t) \neq 0, (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

We first introduce the basic polynomial recursion formalism. Define $\{f_{\ell,\pm}\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, $\{g_{\ell,\pm}\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\{h_{\ell,\pm}\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ recursively by

$$g_{0,+} = -1,\, h_{0,+} = r_x,\, f_{0,+} = -q_x, \tag{2.3}$$

$$i g_{\ell,+,x} = r_x f_{\ell,+} + q_x h_{\ell,+},\, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{2.4}$$

$$f_{\ell,+,x} = 2iq_x g_{\ell+1,+} - 2if_{\ell+1,+},\, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{2.5}$$

$$h_{\ell,+,x} = 2ih_{\ell+1,+} + 2ir_x g_{\ell+1,+},\, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$g_{0,-} = -1/4,\, h_{0,-} = -ir/2,\, f_{0,-} = -iq/2, \tag{2.7}$$

$$i g_{\ell+1,-,x} = q_x h_{\ell,-} + r_x f_{\ell,-},\, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{2.8}$$

$$f_{\ell+1,-,x} = 2iq_x g_{\ell+1,-} - 2if_{\ell,-},\, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{2.9}$$

$$h_{\ell+1,-,x} = 2ih_{\ell,-} + 2ir_x g_{\ell+1,-},\, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0,\, i = \sqrt{-1}, \tag{2.10}$$

where $f_{\ell,\pm,x}$, $g_{\ell,\pm,x}$ and $h_{\ell,\pm,x}$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$, denote the derivative of $f_{\ell,\pm}$, $g_{\ell,\pm}$, $h_{\ell,\pm}$ with respect to the space variable x, respectively. Explicitly, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{0,+} &= -1, \\
g_{1,+} &= -\frac{1}{2}q_x r_x - c_{1,+}, \\
f_{0,+} &= -q_x, \\
f_{1,+} &= \frac{1}{2i}q_{xx} - \frac{1}{2}q_x^2 r_x - c_{1,+}q_x, \\
h_{0,+} &= r_x, \\
h_{1,+} &= \frac{1}{2i}r_{xx} + \frac{1}{2}q_x r_x^2 + c_{1,+}r_x, \\
g_{0,-} &= -\frac{1}{4}, \\
g_{1,-} &= -\frac{1}{2}qr - \frac{1}{4}c_{1,-}, \\
f_{0,-} &= -\frac{1}{2}iq, \\
f_{1,-} &= -\int_{x_0}^{x} (q + iqq_x r)\, dx - \frac{1}{2}ic_{1,-}q, \\
h_{0,-} &= -\frac{1}{2}ir, \\
h_{1,-} &= \int_{x_0}^{x} (r - iqrr_x)\, dx - \frac{1}{2}ic_{1,-}r, \quad \text{etc.}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Here $\{c_{\ell,\pm}\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}}$ denote summation constants which naturally arise when solving the differential equations for $g_{\ell,+}, f_{\ell,-}, h_{\ell,-}$ in (2.3)-(2.10).

To construct the Fokas-Lenells hierarchy we consider the following 2×2 matrix

$$U(\xi, x) = \begin{pmatrix} -iz & q_x\xi \\ r_x\xi & iz \end{pmatrix}, \; z = \xi^2 \tag{2.12}$$

and making the ansatz

$$V_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x) = \begin{pmatrix} iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x) & -F_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x) \\ H_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x) & -iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \underline{n} = (n_-, n_+) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, \tag{2.13}$$

where $G_{\underline{n}}$, $F_{\underline{n}}$ and $H_{\underline{n}}$ are chosen as Laurent polynomials, namely

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_-} \xi^{-2\ell} g_{n_- -\ell,-}(x) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_+} \xi^{2\ell} g_{n_+ -\ell,+}(x), \\ F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_-} \xi^{-2\ell+1} f_{n_- -\ell,-}(x) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_+} \xi^{2\ell} f_{n_+ -\ell,+}(x), \\ H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_-} \xi^{-2\ell+1} h_{n_- -\ell,-}(x) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_+} \xi^{2\ell} h_{n_+ -\ell,+}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Without loss of generality we will only look at the stationary case and add time later on. Then the linear system

$$\psi_x = U(\xi,x)\psi, \quad \psi_t = V_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)\psi, \quad \psi = (\psi_1,\psi_2)^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{2.15}$$

yields the stationary zero-curvature equation

$$-V_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x) + [U(\xi,x), V_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)] = 0. \tag{2.16}$$

Inserting (2.12) and (2.13) into (2.16), one easily finds

$$\xi q_x(x) H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) + \xi r_x(x) F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) = iG_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x), \tag{2.17}$$

$$2izF_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) - 2i\xi q_x(x) G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) = -F_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x), \tag{2.18}$$

$$2izH_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) + 2ir_x(x)\xi G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) = H_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x). \tag{2.19}$$

Insertion of (2.14) into (2.17)-(2.19) then yields the recursion relation (2.3)-(2.10) for $f_{\ell,+}$ and $h_{\ell,+}$ for $\ell = 0,\dots,n_+$, $f_{\ell,-}$ and $h_{\ell,-}$ for $\ell = 0,\dots,n_-$, respectively. For fixed $\underline{n} = (n_+,n_-) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ we obtain the recursion (2.3)-(2.10) for $g_{\ell,\pm}$ for $\ell = 0,\dots,n_\pm - 1$ and

$$f_{n_+-1,+,x} - 2iq_x g_{n_-,-} + 2if_{n_--1,-} = 0, \tag{2.20}$$

$$-h_{n_+-1,+,x} + 2ih_{n_--1,-} + 2ir_x g_{n_-,-} = 0. \tag{2.21}$$

Thus, varying $n_\pm \in \mathbb{N}_0$, equations (2.20) and (2.21) give rise to the stationary Fokas-Lenells (FL) hierarchy which we introduce as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{s-FL}_{\underline{n}}(q,r) = \begin{pmatrix} f_{n_+-1,+,x} - 2iq_x g_{n_-,-} + 2if_{n_--1,-} \\ -h_{n_+-1,+,x} + 2ih_{n_--1,-} + 2ir_x g_{n_-,-} \end{pmatrix} = 0, \\ \underline{n} = (n_-,n_+) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

We record the first few equations in FL hierarchy (2.22) explicitly,

$$\text{s-FL}_{(0,0)}(q,r) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}iq_x \\ -\frac{1}{2}ir_x \end{pmatrix} = 0, \tag{2.23}$$

$$\text{s-FL}_{(1,1)}(q,r) = \begin{pmatrix} -q_{xx} + iqq_xr - 2ic_{1,-}q_x + q \\ -r_{xx} - iqrr_x + 2ic_{1,-}r_x + r \end{pmatrix} = 0. \tag{2.24}$$

In the special case $c_{1,-} = 1$ in (2.24), one obtains the stationary version of the Fokas-Lenells system (1.2).

Subsequently, it will also be useful to work with the corresponding homogeneous coefficients $\hat{f}_{\ell,\pm}, \hat{g}_{\ell,\pm}$, and $\hat{h}_{\ell,\pm}$, defined by the vanishing of the integration constants c_k for $k = 1, \dots, \ell$, and choosing $c_{0,\pm} = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{f}_{0,+} = f_{0,+} = -q_x, \quad \hat{f}_{0,-} = f_{0,-} = -\frac{1}{2}iq, \quad \hat{f}_\ell = f_\ell|_{c_k=0,\ k=1,\dots,\ell}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \\
&\hat{g}_{0,+} = g_{0,+} = -1, \quad \hat{g}_{0,-} = g_{0,-} = -\frac{1}{4}, \quad \hat{g}_{\ell,+} = g_{\ell,+}|_{c_k=0,\ k=1,\dots,\ell}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \\
&\hat{h}_{0,+} = h_{0,+} = r_x, \quad \hat{h}_{0,-} = h_{0,-} = -\frac{1}{2}ir, \quad \hat{h}_{\ell,+} = h_{\ell,+}|_{c_k=0,\ k=1,\dots,\ell}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

By induction one infers that

$$f_{\ell,\pm} = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} c_{\ell-k}\hat{f}_{k,\pm}, \quad g_{\ell,\pm} = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} c_{\ell-k}\hat{g}_{k,\pm}, \quad h_{\ell,\pm} = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} c_{\ell-k}\hat{h}_{k,\pm}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0. \tag{2.26}$$

In a slight abuse of notation we will occasionally stress the dependence of $f_{\ell,\pm}, g_{\ell,\pm}, h_{\ell,\pm}$ on q, r (or x, t) by writing $f_{\ell,\pm}(q,r), g_{\ell,\pm}(q,r), h_{\ell,\pm}(q,r)$ (or $f_{\ell,\pm}(x,t), g_{\ell,\pm}(x,t), h_{\ell,\pm}(x,t)$). Similarly, with $F_{\ell,+}, G_{\ell,+}, H_{\ell,+}$ denoting the polynomial parts of $F_{\underline{\ell}}, G_{\underline{\ell}}, H_{\underline{\ell}}$, respectively, and $F_{\ell,-}, G_{\ell,-}, H_{\ell,-}$ denoting the Laurant parts of $F_{\underline{\ell}}, G_{\underline{\ell}}, H_{\underline{\ell}}, \underline{\ell} = (\ell_-, \ell_+) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&F_{\underline{\ell}}(\xi) = F_{\ell,-}(\xi) + F_{\ell,+}(\xi), \quad G_{\underline{\ell}}(\xi) = G_{\ell,-}(\xi) + G_{\ell,+}(\xi), \\
&H_{\underline{\ell}}(\xi) = H_{\ell,-}(\xi) + H_{\ell,+}(\xi),
\end{aligned}$$

one finds that

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\ell,\pm} &= \sum_{k=1}^{\ell_\pm} c_{\ell_\pm-k,\pm}\widehat{F}_{k,\pm}, \quad G_{\ell,-} = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell_-} c_{\ell_--k,\pm}\widehat{G}_{k,+}, \\
G_{\ell,+} &= \sum_{k=0}^{\ell_+} c_{\ell_+-k,\pm}\widehat{G}_{k,-}, \quad H_{\ell,\pm} = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell_\pm} c_{\ell_\pm-k,\pm}\widehat{H}_{k,\pm},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{F}_{k,\pm}, \widehat{G}_{k,\pm}, \widehat{H}_{k,\pm}$ are corresponding homogeneous quantities of $F_{k,\pm}, G_{k,\pm}, H_{k,\pm}$. From (2.17)-(2.19) one infer that

$$\frac{d}{dx}\det(V_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)) = \frac{d}{dx}\left(G_{\underline{n}}^2(\xi,x) + F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)\right) = 0, \tag{2.27}$$

and hence

$$G_{\underline{n}}^2(\xi,x) + F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) = R_{\underline{n}}(\xi), \tag{2.28}$$

where the Laurent polynomial $R_{\underline{n}}$ is x-independent. One may write $R_{\underline{n}}$ as

$$\begin{gathered} R_{\underline{n}}(\xi) = z^{-2n_-}\prod_{m=0}^{2n+1}(\xi - E_m),\ \{E_m\}_{m=0}^{2n+1} \subset \mathbb{C}, \\ n = 2n_+ + 2n_- - 1 \in \mathbb{N}_0. \end{gathered} \tag{2.29}$$

Moreover, (2.28) also implies

$$\lim_{\xi\to 0} z^{n_-} R_{\underline{n}}(\xi) = \prod_{m=0}^{2n+1} E_m$$

and hence

$$\prod_{m=0}^{2n+1} E_m = \frac{1}{16}. \tag{2.30}$$

Relation (2.28) allows one to introduce a hyperelliptic curve $\mathcal{K}_n$ of arithmetic genus $n = 2n_+ + 2n_- - 1$ (possibly with a singular affine part), where

$$\begin{gathered} \mathcal{K}_n : \mathcal{F}(\xi,y) = y^2 - z^{2n_-}R_{\underline{n}}(\xi) = y^2 - \prod_{m=0}^{2n+1}(\xi - E_m) = 0, \\ n = 2n_+ + 2n_- - 1 \in \mathbb{N}_0. \end{gathered} \tag{2.31}$$

Finally we turn to the time-dependent Fokas-Lenells hierarchy. For that purpose the coefficients q and r are now considered as functions of both the space and time. For each system in this hierarchy, that is, for each $\underline{n}$, we introduce a deformation (time) parameter $t_{\underline{n}} \in \mathbb{R}$ in q, r, replacing $q(x), r(x)$ by $q(x, t_{\underline{n}}), r(x, t_{\underline{n}})$. Moreover, the definitions (2.12), (2.13) and (2.14) of U, V and $F_{\underline{n}}, G_{\underline{n}}, H_{\underline{n}}$, respectively, still apply; However, equation (2.16) now needs to be replaced by

$$U_{t_{\underline{n}}}(\xi,x) - V_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x) + [U(\xi,x), V_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)] = 0, \quad \underline{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, \tag{2.32}$$

which results in the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= U_{t_{\underline{n}}}(\xi,x) - V_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x) + [U(\xi,x), V_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)] \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} -iG_{\underline{n},x}+q_x\xi H_{\underline{n}}+r_x\xi F_{\underline{n}} & q_{xt}\xi+F_{\underline{n},x}+2izF_{\underline{n}}-2iq_x\xi G_{\underline{n}} \\ r_{xt}\xi-H_{\underline{n},x}+2ir_x\xi G_{\underline{n}}+2izH_{\underline{n}} & iG_{\underline{n},x}-q_x\xi H_{\underline{n}}-r_x\xi F_{\underline{n}} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \begin{matrix}\xi(q_{xt_{\underline{n}}}+f_{n_+-1,+,x}-2iq_xg_{n_-,-} \\ +2if_{n_--1,-})\end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix}\xi(r_{xt_{\underline{n}}}-h_{n_+-1,+,x}+2ih_{n_--1,-} \\ +2ir_xg_{n_-,-})\end{matrix} & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

or equivalently,

$$0 = -iG_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x) + q_x(x)\xi H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) + r_x(x)\xi F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x), \tag{2.34}$$

$$q_{xt_{\underline{n}}}(x)\xi = -F_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x) - 2izF_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) + 2iq_x(x)\xi G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x), \tag{2.35}$$

$$r_{xt_{\underline{n}}}(x)\xi = H_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x) - 2ir_x(x)\xi G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x) - 2izH_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x). \tag{2.36}$$

Varying $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$, the collection of evolution equations

$$\mathrm{FL}_{\underline{n}}(q,r) = \begin{pmatrix} q_{xt_{\underline{n}}} + f_{n_+-1,+,x} - 2iq_xg_{n_-,-} + 2if_{n_--1,-} \\ r_{xt_{\underline{n}}} - h_{n_+-1,+,x} + 2ih_{n_--1,-} + 2ir_xg_{n_-,-} \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$
$$t_{\underline{n}} \in \mathbb{R},\ \underline{n} = (n_-, n_+) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, \tag{2.37}$$

then defines the time-dependent Fokas-Lenells hierarchy. Explicitly,

$$\mathrm{FL}_{(0,0)}(q,r) = \begin{pmatrix} q_{xt_{(0,0)}} + \frac{1}{2}iq_x \\ r_{xt_{(0,0)}} - \frac{1}{2}ir_x \end{pmatrix} = 0, \tag{2.38}$$

$$\mathrm{FL}_{(1,1)}(q,r) = \begin{pmatrix} q_{xt_{(1,1)}} - q_{xx} + iqq_xr - 2ic_{1,-}q_x + q \\ r_{xt_{(1,1)}} - r_{xx} - iqrr_x + 2ic_{1,-}r_x + r \end{pmatrix} = 0, \text{ etc.}, \tag{2.39}$$

represent the first few equations of the time-dependent Fokas-Lenells hierarchy. The special case $\underline{n} = (1,1)$, and $c_{1,-} = 1$, that is,

$$\begin{pmatrix} q_{xt_{(1,1)}} - q_{xx} + iqq_xr - 2iq_x + q \\ r_{xt_{(1,1)}} - r_{xx} - iqrr_x + 2ir_x + r \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

represents the Fokas-Lenells system (1.2).

In addition, combing the recursion relation (2.9), (2.10) with (2.37) then yields the first conservation law of the FL hierarchy, that is,

$$(q_x)_t + (f_{n_+-1,+} - f_{n_-,-})_x = 0, \tag{2.40}$$

$$(r_x)_t + (h_{n_-,-,x} - h_{n_+-1,+})_x = 0. \tag{2.41}$$

3 Stationary Fokas-Lenells formalism

This section is devoted to a detailed study of the stationary Fokas-Lenells hierarchy. We first define a fundamental meromorphic function $\phi(P, x)$ on the hyperelliptic curve $\mathcal{K}_n$, using the polynomial recursion formalism described in section 2, and then study the properties of the Baker-Akhiezer function $\psi(P, x, x_0)$, Dubrovin-type equations, trace formulas and theta function representations of $\phi, \psi_1, \psi_2, q, r$.

For major parts of this section we suppose (2.1), (2.2), (2.3)-(2.10), (2.12)-(2.22), keeping $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ fixed.

We recall the hyperelliptic curve

$$\mathcal{K}_n : \mathcal{F}(\xi, y) = y^2 - z^{2n_-} R_{\underline{n}}(\xi) = y^2 - \prod_{m=0}^{2n+1} (\xi - E_m) = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

$$R_{\underline{n}}(\xi) = z^{-2n_-} \prod_{m=0}^{2n+1} (\xi - E_m),\ \{E_m\}_{m=0}^{2n+1} \subset \mathbb{C},\ n = 2n_+ + 2n_- - 1 \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

as introduced in (2.31). Throughout this section we assume $\mathcal{K}_n$ to be nonsingular, that is, we suppose that

$$E_m \neq E_{m'} \text{ for } m \neq m',\ \ m, m' = 0, 1, \cdots, 2n+1. \tag{3.2}$$

$\mathcal{K}_n$ is compactified by joining two points at infinity $P_{\infty_\pm}$, $P_{\infty_+} \neq P_{\infty_-}$, but for notational simplicity the compactification is also denoted by $\mathcal{K}_n$. Points P on

$$\mathcal{K}_n \setminus \{P_{\infty_+}, P_{\infty_-}\}$$

are represented as pairs $P = (\xi, y(P))$, where $y(\cdot)$ is the meromorphic function on $\mathcal{K}_n$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{F}_n(\xi, y(P)) = 0.$$

The complex structure on $\mathcal{K}_n$ is defined in the usual way by introducing local coordinates

$$\zeta_{Q_0} : P \to (\xi - \xi_0)$$

near points $Q_0 = (\xi_0, y(Q_0)) \in \mathcal{K}_n$, which are neither branch nor singular points of $\mathcal{K}_n$; near the points $P_{\infty_\pm} \in \mathcal{K}_n$, the local coordinates are

$$\zeta_{P_{\infty_\pm}} : P \to \xi^{-1},$$

and similarly at branch and singular points of $\mathcal{K}_n$. Hence $\mathcal{K}_n$ becomes a two-sheeted Riemann surface of topological genus n in a standard manner.

The holomorphic map $*$, changing sheets, is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
&* : \begin{cases} \mathcal{K}_n \to \mathcal{K}_n, \\ P = (\xi, y_j(\xi)) \to P^* = (z, y_{j+1(\text{mod } 2)}(\xi)), \quad j = 0, 1, \end{cases} \\
&P^{**} := (P^*)^*, \quad \text{etc.,}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where $y_j(\xi)$, $j = 0, 1$, denote the two branches of $y(P)$ satisfying $\mathcal{F}_n(\xi, y) = 0$, namely

$$(y - y_0(\xi))(y - y_1(\xi)) = y^2 - z^{-2n_-} R_{2n+2}(\xi) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Taking into account (3.4), one easily derives

$$\begin{aligned}
&y_0(\xi) + y_1(\xi) = 0, \\
&y_0(\xi) y_1(\xi) = -z^{-2n_-} R_{2n+2}(\xi), \\
&y_0^2(\xi) + y_1^2(\xi) = 2z^{-2n_-} R_{2n+2}(\xi).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Positive divisors on $\mathcal{K}_n$ of degree n are denoted by

$$\mathcal{D}_{P_1, \ldots, P_n} : \begin{cases} \mathcal{K}_n \to \mathbb{N}_0, \\ P \to \mathcal{D}_{P_1, \ldots, P_n} = \begin{cases} k \text{ if } P \text{ occurs } k \text{ times in } \{P_1, \ldots, P_n\}, \\ 0 \text{ if } P \notin \{P_1, \ldots, P_n\}. \end{cases} \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

Moreover, for a nonzero, meromorphic function f on $\mathcal{K}_n$, the divisor of f is denoted by (f).

For notational simplicity we will usually assume that $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and hence $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \backslash \{(0, 0)\}$. (The trivial case $\underline{n} = (0, 0)$ is excluded in our discussion since the "genus" of corresponding curve is $-1 < 0$.)

We denote by $\{\mu_j(x)\}_{j=1,\cdots,n}$ and $\{\nu_j(x)\}_{j=1,\cdots,n}$ the zeros of $(\cdot)^{2n_- -1} F_{\underline{n}}(\cdot, x)$ and $(\cdot)^{2n_- -1} H_{\underline{n}}(\cdot, x)$, respectively. Thus we may write

$$F_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x) = -q_x \xi^{-2n_- +1} \prod_{j=1}^{n} (\xi - \mu_j(x)), \tag{3.7}$$

$$H_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x) = r_x \xi^{-2n_- +1} \prod_{j=1}^{n} (\xi - \nu_j(x)). \tag{3.8}$$

We now introduce $\{\hat{\mu}_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,n} \subset \mathcal{K}_n$ and $\{\hat{\nu}_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,n} \subset \mathcal{K}_n$ by

$$\hat{\mu}_j(x) = (\mu_j(x), -\mu_j(x)^{2n_-} G_{\underline{n}}(\mu_j(x), x)), \quad j = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$\hat{\nu}_j(x) = (\nu_j(x), \nu_j(x)^{2n_-} G_{\underline{n}}(\nu_j(x), x)), \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \tag{3.10}$$

We also introduce the points $P_{0,\pm}$ by $P_{0,\pm} = \big(0, \pm\frac{1}{4}\big) \in \mathcal{K}_n$ (cf. (2.30)).

Next we define the fundamental meromorphic function on $\mathcal{K}_n$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(P,x) &= -\frac{i\xi^{-2n_-} y - iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)} \\ &= \frac{H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{i\xi^{-2n_-} y + iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

with divisor of $\phi(\cdot,x)$ given by

$$(\phi(\cdot,x)) = \mathcal{D}_{P_{0,-}\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)} - \mathcal{D}_{P_{\infty+}\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)}, \tag{3.12}$$

using (3.7) and (3.8). Here we abbreviated

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\hat{\mu}}(x) &= \{\hat{\mu}_1(x) = P_{0,+}, \hat{\mu}_2(x), \dots, \hat{\mu}_n(x)\}, \\ \underline{\hat{\nu}}(x) &= \{\hat{\nu}_1(x) = P_{\infty-}, \hat{\nu}_2(x), \dots, \hat{\nu}_n(x)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Given $\phi(\cdot,x)$, the stationary Baker-Akhiezer function ψ is then defined by

$$\psi(P,x,x_0) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1(P,x,x_0) \\ \psi_2(P,x,x_0) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0) = \exp\left(\int_{x_0}^{x} dx' \left(-iz + q_x(x')\xi\phi(P,x')\right)\right), \tag{3.14}$$

$$\psi_2(P,x,x_0) = \phi(P,x)\exp\left(\int_{x_0}^{x} dx' \left(r_x(x')\xi\phi^{-1}(P,x') + iz\right)\right). \tag{3.15}$$

Basic properties of ϕ and ψ are summarized in the following result.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume* (3.11), (3.14), (3.15), $P = (z,y) \in \mathcal{K}_n \backslash \{P_{\infty\pm}, P_{0,\pm}\}$, *and let* $(\xi, x, x_0) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}^2$. *Then*

(*i*) $\phi(P,x)$ *satisfies the Riccati-type equation*

$$\phi_x(P,x) = r_x\xi + 2iz\phi(P,x) - q_x\xi\phi^2(P,x) \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$\phi(P,x)\phi(P^*,x) = \frac{H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}, \tag{3.17}$$

$$\phi(P,x) + \phi(P^*,x) = \frac{2iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}, \tag{3.18}$$

$$\phi(P,x) - \phi(P^*,x) = -\frac{2i\xi^{-2n_-} y(P)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}. \tag{3.19}$$

(ii) $\psi(P,x,x_0)$ *satisfies the first-order system*

$$\psi_x(P,x,x_0) = U(\xi,x)\psi, \tag{3.20}$$

$$V_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)\psi(P,x,x_0) = i\xi^{-2n_-}y(P)\psi(P,x,x_0). \tag{3.21}$$

Moreover,

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0) = \sqrt{\frac{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x_0)}}\exp\left(-\int_{x_0}^{x}dx'\left(\frac{q_x(x')\xi^{-2n_-+1}y(P)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x')}\right)\right), \tag{3.22}$$

and

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0)\psi_1(P^*,x,x_0) = \frac{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x_0)}, \tag{3.23}$$

$$\psi_2(P,x,x_0)\psi_2(P^*,x,x_0) = \frac{H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x_0)}, \tag{3.24}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_1(P,x,x_0)\psi_2(P^*,x,x_0) &+ \psi_1(P^*,x,x_0)\psi_2(P,x,x_0)\\ &= \frac{2iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x_0)}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

(iii) ϕ,ψ *satisfy*

$$\psi_2(P,x,x_0) = \phi(P,x)\psi_1(P,x,x_0). \tag{3.26}$$

Proof. To prove (3.16) one uses the definition (3.11) of ϕ and equations (2.17)-(2.19) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_x(P,x) =& -\left(\frac{i\xi^{-2n_-}y(P)-iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}\right)_x\\ =&\frac{iG_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)} + \phi(P,x)\frac{F_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}\\ =&\frac{\xi q_x H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)+\xi r_x F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)} + \phi(P,x)\frac{2izF_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)-2i\xi q_x G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}\\ =&\frac{\xi q_x H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{i\xi^{-2n_-}y(P)+iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}\frac{i\xi^{-2n_-}y(P)-iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)+2iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)}\\ &+\frac{-2i\xi q_x G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)\phi(P,x)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)} + 2iz\phi(P,x) + r_x\xi\\ =&r_x\xi + 2iz\phi(P,x) - q_x\xi\phi^2(P,x).\end{aligned}$$

Equations (3.17)-(3.19) are clear from the definitions of ϕ and y. By definitions of ψ,

$$\psi_{1,x}(P,x,x_0) = (-iz + q_x\xi\phi(P,x))\psi_{1,x}(P,x,x_0), \tag{3.27}$$

$$\psi_{2,x}(P,x,x_0) = (iz + r_x\xi\phi(P,x)^{-1})\psi_2(P,x,x_0), \tag{3.28}$$

the function $\psi_2(P,x,x_0)/\psi_1(P,x,x_0)$ satisfies the first-order linear equation

$$\frac{dL(P,x,x_0)}{dx} = \left(r_x\xi\phi^{-1}(P,x) + 2iz - q_x\xi\phi(P,x)\right) L(P,x,x_0).$$

Since $\psi_2(P,x,x_0)/\psi_1(P,x,x_0)$ and $\phi(P,x)$ take the same value at $x = x_0$, that is, $\psi_2(P,x_0,x_0)/\psi_1(P,x_0,x_0) = \phi(P,x_0)$, one derives (3.26). (3.20), (3.21) are clear from (3.27), (3.28) and (3.26). (3.23)-(3.25) follow from (3.14), (3.15), (3.17)-(3.19). Finally, by (2.18),(3.11), (3.14),

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1(P,x,x_0) &= \exp\left(\int_{x_0}^{x} dx' \left(-iz + q_x(x')\xi\phi(P,x')\right)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\int_{x_0}^{x} dx' \left(-iz + q_x(x')\xi\frac{i\xi^{-2n_-}y(P) - iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x')}{-F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x')}\right)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\int_{x_0}^{x} dx' \left(\frac{F_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x')}{2F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x')} - \frac{i\xi^{-2n_-+1}q_x(x')y(P)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x')}\right)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

which proves (3.22). ☐

Concerning the dynamics of the zeros $\mu_j(x)$ and $\nu_j(x)$ of $F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)$ and $H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)$ one obtains the following Dubrovin-type equations.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose* (2.1) *and the* $\underline{n}$*th stationary Fokas-Lenells equation* (2.22) *holds subject to the constraint* (3.2) *on an open interval* $\widetilde{\Omega}_\mu \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. *Suppose that the zeros* $\{\mu_j(x)\}_{j=0,\dots,n}$ *of* $\xi^{2n_- -1}F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)$ *remain distinct and nonzero for* $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}_\mu$. *Then* $\{\hat{\mu}_j(x)\}_{j=0,\dots,n}$ *defined by* (3.9), *satisfies the following first-order system of differential equations*

$$\mu_{j,x}(x) = \frac{-2iy(\hat{\mu}_j(x))}{\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\mu_j(x) - \mu_k(x))}, \quad j = 1,\dots,n, \ x \in \widetilde{\Omega}_\mu. \tag{3.30}$$

Next, assume $\mathcal{K}_n$ *to be nonsingular and introduce initial condition*

$$\{\hat{\mu}_j(x_0)\}_{j=1,\dots,n} \subset \mathcal{K}_n \tag{3.31}$$

for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, *where* $\mu_j(x_0) \neq 0, j = 1,\dots,n$, *are assumed to be distinct. Then there exists an open interval* $\Omega_\mu \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, *with* $x_0 \in \Omega_\mu$, *such that the* *initial value problem* (3.30), (3.31) *has a unique solution* $\{\hat{\mu}_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,n} \subset \mathcal{K}_n$ *satisfying*

$$\hat{\mu}_j \in C^{\infty}(\Omega_\mu, \mathcal{K}_n), \quad j = 0, \ldots, n, \tag{3.32}$$

and $\mu_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$, *remain distinct and nonzero on* Ω_μ.
For the zeros $\{\nu_j(x)\}_{j=1,\ldots,n}$ *of* $\xi^{2n_- -1} H_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x)$ *similar statements hold with* μ_j *and* Ω_μ *replaced by* ν_j *and* Ω_ν, *etc. In particular,* $\{\hat{\nu}_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,n}$, *defined by* (3.10), *satisfies the system*

$$\nu_{j,x}(x) = \frac{-2iy(\hat{\mu}_j(x))}{\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\nu_j(x) - \nu_k(x))}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n, \ x \in \widetilde{\Omega}_\mu. \tag{3.33}$$

Proof. We only prove equation (3.30) since the proof of (3.33) follows in an identical manner. Inserting $\xi = \mu_j$ into equation (2.18), one concludes from (3.9),

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\underline{n},x}(\mu_j) &= q_x \mu_j^{-2n_- +1} \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k\neq j}}^{n} (\mu_j - \mu_k) = 2iq_x \mu_j G_{\underline{n}}(\mu_j) \\ &= -2iq_x \mu_j^{-2n_- +1} y(\hat{\mu}_j), \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

proving (3.30). The smooth assertion (3.32) is clear as long as $\hat{\mu}_j$ stays away from the branch points $(E_m, 0)$. In case $\hat{\mu}_j$ hits such a branch point, one can use the local chart around $(E_m, 0)$ (with the local chart $\zeta = \sigma(\xi - E_m)^{1/2}, \sigma \in \{1, -1\}$) to verify (3.32).

□

Next, we turn to the trace formulas of the FL invariants, that is, expressions of $f_{\ell,\pm}$ and $h_{\ell,\pm}$ in terms of symmetric functions of the zeros μ_j and ν_ℓ of $(\cdot)^{2n_- -1} F_{\underline{n}}(\cdot)$ and $(\cdot)^{2n_- -1} H_{\underline{n}}(\cdot)$, respectively. For simplicity we just record the simplest case.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose* (2.1) *and the* $\underline{n}$*th stationary Fokas-Lenells system*

(2.22) *holds and let* $x \in \mathbb{R}$. *Then*

$$\frac{q_{xx}}{2iq_x} - \frac{1}{2} q_x r_x - c_{1,+} = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j, \tag{3.35}$$

$$\frac{r_{xx}}{2ir_x} + \frac{1}{2} q_x r_x + c_{1,+} = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} \nu_j, \tag{3.36}$$

$$\frac{iq}{2q_x} = (-1)^n \prod_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j, \tag{3.37}$$

$$\frac{ir}{2r_x} = (-1)^{n-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \nu_j. \tag{3.38}$$

Proof. (3.35)-(3.38) follow by comparison powers of ξ substituting (3.7) and (3.8) into (2.14) taking into account (2.11). ☐

Next we turn to the asymptotic properties of ϕ and $\phi_j, j = 1, 2$.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose* (2.1) *and the* $\underline{n}$*th stationary Fokas-Lenells system* (2.22) *holds and let* $P \in \mathcal{K}_n \backslash \{P_{\infty\pm}, P_{0,\pm}\}, x \in \mathbb{R}$. *Then*

$$\phi(P,x) \underset{\zeta \to 0}{=} \begin{cases} 2i[q_x(x)]^{-1}\zeta^{-1} + O(\zeta), & P \to P_{\infty+}, \\ [ir_x(x)/2]\,\zeta + O(\zeta^3), & P \to P_{\infty-}, \end{cases} \quad \zeta = \xi^{-1}, \tag{3.39}$$

$$\phi(P,x) \underset{\zeta \to 0}{=} \begin{cases} q(x)^{-1}\zeta^{-1} + O(\zeta), & P \to P_{0,+}, \\ r(x)\,\zeta + O(\zeta^3), & P \to P_{0,-}, \end{cases} \quad \zeta = \xi, \tag{3.40}$$

$$\psi_1(P,x) \underset{\zeta \to 0}{=} \begin{cases} e^{i(x-x_0)\zeta^{-2}+O(1)}, & P \to P_{\infty+}, \\ e^{-i(x-x_0)\zeta^{-2}+O(1)}, & P \to P_{\infty-}, \end{cases} \quad \zeta = \xi^{-1}, \tag{3.41}$$

$$\psi_1(P,x) \underset{\zeta \to 0}{=} \begin{cases} \frac{q(x)}{q(x_0)}(1 + O(\zeta)), & P \to P_{0,+}, \\ 1 + O(\zeta), & P \to P_{0,-}, \end{cases} \quad \zeta = \xi, \tag{3.42}$$

$$\psi_2(P,x) \underset{\zeta \to 0}{=} \begin{cases} \left(\frac{2i}{q_x(x)}\zeta^{-1} + O(\zeta)\right) e^{i(x-x_0)\zeta^{-2}+O(1)}, & P \to P_{\infty+}, \\ \left(\frac{ir_x(x)}{2}\,\zeta + O(\zeta^3)\right) e^{-i(x-x_0)\zeta^{-2}+O(1)}, & P \to P_{\infty-}, \end{cases} \quad \zeta = \xi^{-1}, \tag{3.43}$$

$$\psi_2(P,x) \underset{\zeta \to 0}{=} \begin{cases} \frac{1}{q(x_0)}\zeta^{-1} + O(\zeta), & P \to P_{0,+}, \\ r(x)\zeta + O(\zeta^2), & P \to P_{0,-}, \end{cases} \quad \zeta = \xi. \tag{3.44}$$

Proof. The existence of the asymptotic expansions of ϕ in terms of the appropriate local coordinates $\zeta = \xi^{-1}$ near $P_{\infty\pm}$ and $\zeta = \xi$ near $P_{0,\pm}$ is clear from its explicit expression in (3.11). Next, we compute these explicit expansions coefficients in (3.39) and (3.40). Inserting each of the following asymptotic expansions

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi &= \phi_0\zeta^{-1} + \phi_1 + O(\zeta), \quad \text{as } P \to P_{\infty+}, && (3.45)\\
\phi &= \phi_0\zeta + \phi_1\zeta^2 + O(\zeta^2), \quad \text{as } P \to P_{\infty-}, && (3.46)\\
\phi &= \phi_0\zeta^{-1} + \phi_1 + O(\zeta), \quad \text{as } P \to P_{0,+}, && (3.47)\\
\phi &= \phi_0\zeta + \phi_1\zeta^2 + O(\zeta^2), \quad \text{as } P \to P_{0,-} && (3.48)
\end{aligned}
$$

into the Riccati-type equation (3.16) and, upon comparing coefficients of powers of ξ, which determines the expansion coefficients of ϕ_k in (3.45)-(3.48), one concludes (3.39) and (3.40). (3.41), (3.42) are clear from (3.14), (3.39) and (3.40). (3.43) and (3.44) follow by (3.39)-(3.42) and (3.26). ☐

Next, we introduce the holomorphic differentials $\eta_\ell(P)$ on $\mathcal{K}_n$

$$\eta_\ell(P) = \frac{\xi^{\ell-1}}{y(P)} d\xi, \qquad \ell = 1, \dots, n, \tag{3.49}$$

and choose a homology basis $\{a_j, b_j\}_{j=1}^n$ on $\mathcal{K}_n$ in such a way that the intersection matrix of the cycles satisfies

$$a_j \circ b_k = \delta_{j,k}, \quad a_j \circ a_k = 0, \quad b_j \circ b_k = 0, \quad j,k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Associated with $\mathcal{K}_n$ one introduces an invertible matrix $E \in \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E = (E_{j,k})_{n\times n}, \quad E_{j,k} = \int_{a_k} \eta_j,\\
&\underline{c}(k) = (c_1(k), \dots, c_n(k)), \quad c_j(k) = (E^{-1})_{j,k},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.50}
$$

and the normalized holomorphic differentials

$$\omega_j = \sum_{\ell=1}^n c_j(\ell)\eta_\ell, \quad \int_{a_k} \omega_j = \delta_{j,k}, \quad \int_{b_k} \omega_j = \tau_{j,k}, \quad j,k = 1, \dots, n. \tag{3.51}$$

Apparently, the Riemann matrix $\tau = (\tau_{i,j})$ is symmetric and has a positive-definite imaginary part. Associated with τ one defines the period lattice L_n in $\mathbb{C}^n$ by

$$L_n = \{\underline{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n | \; \underline{z} = \underline{N} + \tau\underline{M}, \; \underline{N}, \underline{M} \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}.$$

The Riemann theta function associated with Riemann surface $\mathcal{K}_n$ and the homology basis $\{a_j, b_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,n}$ is given by

$$\theta(\underline{z}) = \sum_{\underline{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^n} \exp\Big(2\pi i(\underline{n}, \underline{z}) + \pi i(\underline{n}, \tau\underline{n})\Big), \quad \underline{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n, \tag{3.52}$$

where $(\underline{A}, \underline{B}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \overline{A}_j B_j$ denotes the inner product in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then the Jacobi variety $J(\mathcal{K}_n)$ of $\mathcal{K}_n$ is defined by

$$J(\mathcal{K}_n) = \mathbb{C}^n/L_n,$$

and the Abel maps are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{A}_{Q_0} :&\mathcal{K}_n \to J(\mathcal{K}_n), \\ &P \mapsto \underline{A}_{Q_0}(P) = (\underline{A}_{Q_0,1}(P), \ldots, \underline{A}_{Q_0,n}(P)) \\ &\qquad\qquad\quad = \left(\int_{Q_0}^P \omega_1, \ldots, \int_{Q_0}^P \omega_n\right) (\mathrm{mod}\ L_n) \end{aligned} \tag{3.53}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\alpha}_{Q_0} :& \mathrm{Div}(\mathcal{K}_n) \to J(\mathcal{K}_n), \\ &\mathcal{D} \mapsto \underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}) = \sum_{P\in\mathcal{K}_n} \mathcal{D}(P)\underline{A}_{Q_0}(P) \\ &\qquad\qquad\quad \triangleq (\alpha_{Q_0,1}(\mathcal{D}), \ldots, \alpha_{Q_0,n}(\mathcal{D})), \end{aligned} \tag{3.54}$$

where Q_0 is a fixed base point and the same path is chosen from Q_0 to P in (3.53) and (3.54).

Next, let $\Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}}$, be the normal differential of the third kind holomorphic on $\mathcal{K}_n \backslash \{P_{0,-}, P_{\infty+}\}$ with simple poles at $P_{0,-}$ and $P_{\infty+}$, and residues 1 and -1, respectively. Explicitly, one writes $\Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}}$ as

$$\Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}} = \left(\frac{y - 1/2}{\xi} - \prod_{j=1}^n (\xi - \lambda'_j)\right) \frac{d\xi}{2y}, \tag{3.55}$$

where the constants $\{\lambda'_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,n} \subset \mathbb{C}$ are uniquely determined by employing the normalization

$$\int_{a_j} \Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}} = 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n.$$

The explicit formula (3.55) then implies the following asymptotic expansion

$$\int_{Q_0}^{P} \Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}} \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \ln(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} + \omega_0^{0,\pm} + O(\zeta), \quad \omega_0^{0,\pm} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad P \to P_{0,\pm} \tag{3.56}$$

$$\int_{Q_0}^{P} \Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}} \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \begin{bmatrix} -\ln(\zeta) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \omega_0^{\infty,\pm} + O(\zeta), \quad \omega_0^{\infty,\pm} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad P \to P_{\infty\pm}. \tag{3.57}$$

Moreover, the Abelian diffrential of the second kind $\Omega^{(2)}_{P_{\infty\pm},1}$ are chosen such that

$$\Omega^{(2)}_{P_{\infty\pm},1} \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} [\zeta^{-3} + O(1)]d\zeta, \quad P \to P_{\infty\pm}, \tag{3.58}$$

$$\int_{a_j} \Omega^{(2)}_{P_{\infty\pm},1} = 0, \quad 1 \le j \le n, \tag{3.59}$$

$$\underline{U}_0^{(2)} = (\underline{U}_{0,1}^{(2)}, \dots, \underline{U}_{0,n}^{(2)}), \quad \underline{U}_{0,j}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{b_j} \Omega_0^{(2)}, \quad \Omega_0^{(2)} = 2(\Omega^{(2)}_{P_{\infty+},1} - \Omega^{(2)}_{P_{\infty-},1}), \tag{3.60}$$

$$\int_{Q_0}^{P} \Omega_0^{(2)} \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \mp[\zeta^{-2} + e_{0,0} + e_{0,1}\zeta + O(\zeta^2)], \quad P \to P_{\infty\pm}, \tag{3.61}$$

$$\int_{Q_0}^{P} \Omega_0^{(2)} \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} e_{0,\pm} + e_{1,\pm}\zeta + O(\zeta^2), \quad P \to P_{0,\pm}. \tag{3.62}$$

In the following it will be convenient to introduce the abbreviations

$$\begin{gathered}\underline{\xi}(P, \underline{Q}) = \underline{\Xi}_{Q_0} - \underline{A}_{Q_0}(P) + \underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{Q}}), \\ P \in \mathcal{K}_n,\, \underline{Q} = (Q_1, \dots, Q_n) \in \operatorname{Sym}^n(\mathcal{K}_n),\end{gathered} \tag{3.63}$$

where $\underline{\Xi}_{Q_0}$ is the vector of Riemann constants (cf.(A.45) [7]). It turns out that $\underline{z}(\cdot, \underline{Q})$ is independent of the choice of base point Q_0 (cf.(A.52), (A.53) [7]).

Given these preparations, the theta function representations of ϕ, ψ_1, ϕ_2, q and r then read as follows.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose* (2.1) *and the* $\underline{n}$*th stationary Fokas-Lenells equation* (2.22) *holds subject to the constraint* (3.2) *on an open interval* $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. *Moreover, let* $P \in \mathcal{K}_n \backslash \{P_{0,-}, P_{\infty+}\}$ *and* $x \in \Omega$. *In addition, suppose that*

$\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)}$, or equivalently, $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)}$ is nonspecial for $x \in \Omega$. Then, $\phi, \psi_1, \psi_2, q, r$ admit the following representations

$$\phi(P,x) = C(x)\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P,\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P,\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}\exp\left(\int_{Q_0}^{P}\Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}}\right), \tag{3.64}$$

$$\psi_1(P,x) = C(x,x_0)\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P,\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P,\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}\exp\left(-i(x-x_0)\int_{Q_0}^{P}\Omega^{(2)}_0\right), \tag{3.65}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_2(P,x) = {}& C(x)C(x,x_0)\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P,\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P,\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}\\ &\times\exp\left(\int_{Q_0}^{P}\Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}} - i(x-x_0)\int_{Q_0}^{P}\Omega^{(2)}_0\right),\end{aligned} \tag{3.66}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}C(x) = {}& \frac{1}{q(x_0)}\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)))}\\ &\times e^{-i(x-x_0)(e_{0,-}-e_{0,+})-\omega_0^{0,+}},\end{aligned} \tag{3.67}$$

$$C(x,x_0) = \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}e^{i(x-x_0)e_{0,-}}. \tag{3.68}$$

The Abel map linearizes the divisors $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)}$ in the sense that

$$\underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)}) = \underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)}) - i\underline{U}^{(2)}_0(x-x_0), \tag{3.69}$$

$$\underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)}) = \underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)}) - i\underline{U}^{(2)}_0(x-x_0). \tag{3.70}$$

Moreover, one derives

$$q(x) = q(x_0)\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}e^{i(x-x_0)(e_{0,-}-e_{0,+})}, \tag{3.71}$$

$$r(x) = r(x_0)\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x_0)))}\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x_0)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)))}e^{-i(x-x_0)(e_{0,-}-e_{0,+})}, \tag{3.72}$$

$$q(x_0)r(x_0) = \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x_0)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x_0)))}e^{\omega_0^{0,-}-\omega_0^{0,+}}. \tag{3.73}$$

Proof. First, we temporarily assume that

$$\mu_j(x) \neq \mu_{j'}(x), \quad \nu_k(x) \neq \nu_{k'}(x) \quad \text{for } j \neq j', k \neq k' \text{ and } x \in \widetilde{\Omega}, \tag{3.74}$$

for appropriate $\widetilde{\Omega} \subseteq \Omega$. Since by (3.12), $\mathcal{D}_{P_{0,-}\underline{\hat{\nu}}} \sim \mathcal{D}_{P_{\infty+}\underline{\hat{\mu}}}$, and $(P_{0,-})^* \notin \{\hat{\nu}_1, \cdots, \hat{\nu}_n\}$ by hypothesis, one can use Theorem A.31 in [7] to conclude that $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}} \in \mathrm{Sym}^n(\mathcal{K}_n)$ is nonspecial. This argument is of course symmetric with respect to $\underline{\hat{\mu}}$ and $\underline{\hat{\nu}}$. Thus, $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}}$ is nonspecial if and only if $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\nu}}}$ is.

Next we define the right-hand side of (3.65) to be $\widetilde{\psi}_1$. We intend to prove $\psi_1 = \widetilde{\psi}_1$, with ψ_1 given by (3.14). For that purpose we first investigate the divisor of ψ_1. Since the zeros and poles can only come from zeros of $F_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x)$ in (2.14), one computes using (3.9), the definition (3.11) of ϕ, and the Dubrovin equations (3.30),

$$\begin{aligned} q_{x'}(x')\xi\phi(P,x') &\underset{P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x')}{=} -q_x(x')\mu_j(x')\frac{2iy(P)}{-q_{x'}(x')\mu_j(x')\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\mu_j(x')-\mu_k(x'))} \\ &\qquad\quad \times \frac{1}{\xi-\mu_j(x')} + O(1) \\ &\underset{P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x')}{=} \partial_{x'}\ln(\xi-\mu_j(x')) + O(1). \end{aligned} \tag{3.75}$$

Together with (3.14) this yields

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0) = \begin{cases} (\xi-\mu_j(x))O(1), & \text{as } \; P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x)\neq\hat{\mu}_j(x_0), \\ O(1), & \text{as } \; P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x)=\hat{\mu}_j(x_0), \\ (\xi-\mu_j(x_0))^{-1}O(1) & \text{as } \; P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x_0)\neq\hat{\mu}_j(x), \end{cases} \tag{3.76}$$
$$P=(\xi,y)\in\mathcal{K}_n, \; x,x_0\in\widetilde{\Omega},$$

with $O(1)\neq 1$. Consequently, ψ_1 and $\widetilde{\psi}_1$ have identical zeros and poles on $\mathcal{K}_n\backslash\{P_{\infty\pm}\}$, which are all simple by hypothesis (3.74). Next, comparing the behavior of ψ_1 and $\widetilde{\psi}_1$ near $P_{\infty\pm}$, taking into account (3.14) and (3.61), the expression (3.65) for $\widetilde{\psi}_1$, and (3.41), then shows that ψ_1 and $\widetilde{\psi}_1$ have identical exponential behavior up to order $O(1)$ near $P_{\infty\pm}$. Thus, ψ_1 and $\widetilde{\psi}_1$ share the same singularities and zeros, and the Riemann-Roch-type uniqueness result (cf. Lemma 3.4 [6]) then proves that ψ_1 and $\widetilde{\psi}_1$ coincide up to normalization. By (3.62) one infers from the right-hand side of (3.65) that

$$\widetilde{\psi}_1(P,x,x_0) \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} C(x,x_0)\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}e^{-i(x-x_0)e_{0,-}} + O(\zeta) \quad \text{as } P\to P_{0,-}, \tag{3.77}$$

$$\widetilde{\psi}_1(P,x,x_0) \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} C(x,x_0)\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)))}e^{i(x-x_0)e_{0,+}} + O(\zeta) \quad \text{as } P\to P_{0,+}. \tag{3.78}$$

A comparison of (3.42) and (3.77), (3.78) then yields (3.68), (3.71) subject to (3.74). By (3.12), one infers that $\phi(P,x)\exp(-\int_{Q_0}^{P}\Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}})$ must be of the type

$$\phi(P,x)\exp\left(-\int_{Q_0}^{P}\Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}}\right)=C(x)\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P,\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P,\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))} \tag{3.79}$$

for some function $C(x), x\in\mathbb{C}$. A comparison of (3.79) and asymptotic relations (3.40) then yields, with the help of (3.56), the following expressions

$$\frac{1}{q(x)}=C(x)\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}e^{\omega_0^{0,+}}, \tag{3.80}$$

$$r(x)=C(x)\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}e^{\omega_0^{0,-}}, \tag{3.81}$$

$$q(x)r(x)=\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x)))}e^{\omega_0^{0,-}-\omega_0^{0,+}}. \tag{3.82}$$

Taking into account (3.68),(3.71),(3.80)-(3.82), one easily derives (3.67), (3.71)-(3.73). (3.66) follows by (3.26), (3.64) and (3.65). Next we only prove the linearity of the Abel map with respect to x in (3.69) since the proof for (3.70) can be derived in an identical fashion. Using the Dubrovin equations (3.30), expression (3.51), and Lagrange's interpolation formula

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\mu_j^{\ell-1}}{\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\mu_j-\mu_\ell)}=\begin{cases}0 & \ell\neq n\\ 1 & \ell=n\end{cases},\ \mu_j\in\mathbb{C},\ \ell,j=1,\dots,n,$$

one infers

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_x\underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)})=&\partial_x\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\int_{Q_0}^{\hat{\mu}_j(x)}\underline{\omega}\Big)\\ =&\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mu_{j,x}(x)\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\underline{c}(\ell)\frac{\mu_j^{\ell-1}(x)}{y(\hat{\mu}_j(x))}\\ =&\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\frac{-2i\mu_j^{\ell-1}(x)\underline{c}(\ell)}{\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\mu_j(x)-\mu_\ell(x))}\\ =&-2i\underline{c}(n)=-i\underline{U}_0^{(2)},\end{aligned} \tag{3.83}$$

which proves (3.69). The extension of all these results from $\widetilde{\Omega}$ to Ω then simply follows from the continuity of $\underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}$ and the hypothesis of $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x)}$ being nonspecial on Ω. ☐

4 Quasi-periodic Solutions

In this section, we extend the algebro-geometric analysis of Section 2,3 to the time-dependent FL hierarchy.

Throughout this section we assume (2.2) holds.

The time-dependent algebro-geometric initial value problem of the FL hierarchy is to solve the time-dependent $\underline{r}$th FL flow with a stationary solution of the $\underline{n}$th equation as initial data in the hierarchy. More precisely, given $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \backslash \{(0,0)\}$, based on the solution $q^{(0)}, r^{(0)}$ of the $\underline{n}$th stationary HS equation $\text{s-FL}_{\underline{n}}(q^{(0)}, r^{(0)}) = 0$ associated with $\mathcal{K}_n$ and a set of integration constants $\{c_{\ell,\pm}\}_{\ell=1,\dots,n} \subset \mathbb{C}$, we want to build up a solution q, r of the $\underline{r}$th FL flow $\text{FL}_{\underline{r}}(q,r) = 0$ such that $q(t_{0,\underline{r}}) = q^{(0)}, r(t_{0,\underline{r}}) = r^{(0)}$ for some $t_{0,\underline{r}} \in \mathbb{R}, \underline{r} \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \backslash \{(0,0)\}$. To emphasize that the integration constants in the definitions of the stationary and the time-dependent FL equations are independent of each other, we indicate this by adding a tilde on all the time-dependent quantities. Hence we shall employ the notation $\widetilde{V}_{\underline{r}}$, $\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}$, $\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}}$, $\widetilde{H}_{\underline{r}}$, $\tilde{f}_s$, $\tilde{g}_{s,\pm}$, $\tilde{h}_{s,\pm}$, $\tilde{c}_{s,\pm}$ in order to distinguish them from $V_{\underline{n}}$, $F_{\underline{n}}$, $G_{\underline{n}}$, $H_{\underline{n}}$, $f_{s,\pm}$, $g_{s,\pm}$, $h_{s,\pm}$, $c_{s,\pm}$ with respect to ξ in the following. In addition, we mark the individual $\underline{r}$th FL flow by a separate time variable $t_{\underline{r}} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Summing up, we are interested in solutions q, r of the time-dependent algebro-geometric initial value problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{\text{FL}}_{\underline{n}}(q,r) = \begin{pmatrix} q_{xt_{\underline{r}}} + f_{r_+-1,+,x} - 2iq_x g_{r_-,-} + 2if_{r_--1,-} \\ r_{xt_{\underline{r}}} - h_{r_+-1,+,x} + 2ih_{r_--1,-} + 2ir_x g_{r_-,-} \end{pmatrix} = 0, \\ &(q,r)|_{t_{\underline{r}}=t_{0,\underline{r}}} = (q^{(0)}, r^{(0)}), \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

$$\text{s-FL}_{\underline{n}}(q^{(0)}, r^{(0)}) = \begin{pmatrix} f_{n_+-1,+,x} - 2iq_x^{(0)} g_{n_-,-} + 2if_{n_--1,-} \\ -h_{n_+-1,+,x} + 2ih_{n_--1,-} + 2ir_x^{(0)} g_{n_-,-} \end{pmatrix} = 0, \tag{4.2}$$

for some $t_{0,\underline{r}} \in \mathbb{R}$, where $q = q(x, t_{\underline{r}}), r = r(x, t_{\underline{r}})$ satisfy (2.2) and a fixed curve $\mathcal{K}_n$ is associated with the stationary solution $q^{(0)}, r^{(0)}$ in (4.2). Here

$$\underline{n} = (n_+, n_-) \in \mathbb{N}^2,\ \underline{r} = (r_+, r_-) \in \mathbb{N}^2,\ n = 2n_+ + 2n_- - 1 \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Noticing that the FL flows are isospectral, we further assume that (4.2) holds not only for $t_{\underline{r}} = t_{0,\underline{r}}$, but also for all $t_{\underline{r}} \in \mathbb{R}$. In terms of Lax pairs this amounts to solving the zero-curvature equations

$$U_{t_{\underline{r}}}(\xi, x, t_{\underline{r}}) - \widetilde{V}_{\underline{r},x}(\xi, x, t_{\underline{r}}) + [U(\xi, x, t_{\underline{r}}), \widetilde{V}_{\underline{r}}(\xi, x, t_{\underline{r}})] = 0, \tag{4.3}$$

$$-V_{\underline{n},x}(\xi, x, t_{\underline{r}}) + [U(\xi, x), V_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x, t_{\underline{r}})] = 0, \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
U(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) &= \begin{pmatrix} -iz & q_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})\xi \\ r_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})\xi & iz \end{pmatrix}, \; z=\xi^2, \\
V_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) &= \begin{pmatrix} iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) & -F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) \\ H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) & -iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) \end{pmatrix}, \\
\widetilde{V}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x,\underline{r}) &= \begin{pmatrix} i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) & -\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) \\ \widetilde{H}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) & -i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_-} \xi^{-2\ell} g_{n_- -\ell,-}(x,t_{\underline{r}}) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_+} \xi^{2\ell} g_{n_+ -\ell,+}(x,t_{\underline{r}}), \tag{4.6}$$

$$F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_-} \xi^{-2\ell+1} f_{n_- -\ell,-}(x,t_{\underline{r}}) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_+} \xi^{2\ell} f_{n_+ -\ell,+}(x,t_{\underline{r}}), \tag{4.7}$$

$$H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_-} \xi^{-2\ell+1} h_{n_- -\ell,-}(x,t_{\underline{r}}) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_+} \xi^{2\ell} h_{n_+ -\ell,+}(x,t_{\underline{r}}), \tag{4.8}$$

$$\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) = \sum_{s=0}^{r_-} \xi^{-2s} \tilde{g}_{r_- -s,-}(x,t_{\underline{r}}) + \sum_{s=1}^{r_+} \xi^{2s} \tilde{g}_{r_+ -s,+}(x,t_{\underline{r}}), \tag{4.9}$$

$$\widetilde{F}_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) = \sum_{s=0}^{r_-} \xi^{-2s+1} \tilde{f}_{r_- -s,-}(x,t_{\underline{r}}) + \sum_{s=0}^{r_+} \xi^{2s} \tilde{f}_{r_+ -s,+}(x,t_{\underline{r}}), \tag{4.10}$$

$$\widetilde{H}_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) = \sum_{s=0}^{r_-} \xi^{-2s+1} \tilde{h}_{r_- -s,-}(x,t_{\underline{r}}) + \sum_{s=0}^{r_+} \xi^{2s} \tilde{h}_{r_+ -s,+}(x,t_{\underline{r}}), \tag{4.11}$$

for fixed $\underline{n},\underline{r}\in\mathbb{N}_0^2\backslash\{(0,0)\}$. Here $f_{\ell,\pm}$, $g_{\ell,\pm}$, $h_{\ell,\pm}$, $\tilde{f}_s$, $\tilde{g}_s$, and $\tilde{h}_s$ are defined as in (2.3)-(2.10), with $q(x)$ replaced by $q(x,t_{\underline{r}})$, etc, and with appropriate integration constants $c_{\ell,\pm}, \ell\in\mathbb{N}$, and $\tilde{c}_{s,\pm}, s\in\mathbb{N}$. Explicitly, (4.3) and (4.4) are equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
&0 = -iG_{\underline{r},x}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) + q_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})\xi H_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) + r_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})\xi F_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}), \\
&q_{xt_{\underline{r}}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})\xi = -F_{\underline{r},x}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) - 2izF_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) + 2iq_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})\xi G_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}), \\
&r_{xt_{\underline{n}}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})\xi = H_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) - 2ir_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})\xi G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) - 2izH_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}), \\
&0 = -iG_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) + \xi q_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) + \xi r_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}), \\
&0 = F_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) + 2izF_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) - 2i\xi q_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}), \\
&0 = -H_{\underline{n},x}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) + 2izH_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) + 2ir_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})\xi G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Equation (4.12) then yields

$$\frac{d}{dx}\det(V_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})) = \frac{d}{dx}\left(G_{\underline{n}}^2(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) + F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})\right) = 0, \tag{4.13}$$

and meanwhile (cf. Lemma 4.2)

$$\frac{d}{dt_{\underline{r}}}\det(V_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})) = \frac{d}{dt_r}\Big(G_{\underline{n}}(z,x,t_{\underline{r}})^2 + F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})\Big) = 0. \tag{4.14}$$

Hence, $G_{\underline{n}}(\xi)^2 + zF_{\underline{n}}(\xi)H_{\underline{n}}(\xi)$ is independent of variables both x and $t_{\underline{r}}$, which implies the basic identity (2.28)

$$G_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})^2 + F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}}) = R_{\underline{n}}(\xi) \tag{4.15}$$

holds and the hyperelliptic curve $\mathcal{K}_n$ is still given by (2.31).

As in the stationary context (3.9), (3.10) we introduce

$$\hat{\mu}_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}) = (\mu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}), -\mu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})^{2n-}G_{\underline{n}}(\mu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}),x,t_{\underline{r}})), \quad j=1,\dots,n, \tag{4.16}$$

and

$$\hat{\nu}_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}) = (\nu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}), \nu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})^{2n-}G_{\underline{n}}(\nu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}),x,t_{\underline{r}})), \quad j=1,\dots,n. \tag{4.17}$$

In analogy to (3.11), one defines the following meromorphic function $\phi(\cdot,x,t_{\underline{r}})$ on $\mathcal{K}_n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(P,x,t_{\underline{r}}) &= -\frac{i\xi^{-2n-}y - iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})}\\ &= \frac{H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})}{i\xi^{-2n-}y + iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})},\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

with divisor of $\phi(\cdot,x,t_{\underline{r}})$ given by

$$(\phi(\cdot,x,t_{\underline{r}})) = \mathcal{D}_{P_{0,-}\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})} - \mathcal{D}_{P_{\infty+}\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})}. \tag{4.19}$$

The time-dependent Baker-Ahiezer function ψ is then defined in terms of ϕ

by

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) =& \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) \\ \psi_2(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) \end{pmatrix}, \\
\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) =& \exp\Big(\int_{t_{0,\underline{r}}}^{t_{\underline{r}}} ds (i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x_0,s) - \widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x_0,s)\phi(P,x_0,s)) \\
&+ \int_{x_0}^{x} dx' \left(-iz + q_x(x',t_{\underline{r}})\xi\phi(P,x',t_{\underline{r}})\right)\Big), \qquad (4.20) \\
\psi_2(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) =& \phi(P,x,t_{\underline{r}})\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}), \\
& P=(\xi,y)\in\mathcal{K}_n\backslash\{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}\}, (x,t_{\underline{r}})\in\mathbb{R}^2, \qquad (4.21)
\end{aligned}$$

with fixed $(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})\in\mathbb{R}^2$.

The following lemma records basic properties of ϕ and ψ in analogy to the stationary case discussed in Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume* (2.2) *and suppose that* (4.3), (4.4) *hold.*

(i) Let $P=(\xi,y)\in\mathcal{K}_n\backslash\{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}\}$ *and* $(x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}})\in\mathbb{R}^4$. *Then* ϕ *satisfies*

$$\phi_x(P) = r_x\xi + 2iz\phi(P) - q_x\xi\phi^2(P), \qquad (4.22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(q_x\xi\phi(P))_{t_{\underline{r}}} =& \left(-\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}\phi(P) + i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}}\right)_x, \qquad (4.23) \\
\phi_{t_{\underline{r}}}(P) =& (q_x\xi)^{-1}\left(2iz\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}\phi(P) - \widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}\phi_x(P) + i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r},x}\right) - 2i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}}\phi(P) \\
=& \widetilde{H}_{\underline{r}} - 2i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}}\phi(P) + \widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}\phi^2(P), \qquad (4.24) \\
\phi(P)\phi(P^*) =& \frac{H_{\underline{n}}(\xi)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi)}, \qquad (4.25) \\
\phi(P)+\phi(P^*) =& \frac{2iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi)}, \qquad (4.26) \\
\phi(P)-\phi(P^*) =& -\frac{2i\xi^{-2n_-}y(P)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi)}. \qquad (4.27)
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) Assuming $P=(z,y)\in\mathcal{K}_n\backslash\{P_{0,\pm}\}$, *then* ψ *satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_x(P) =& U(\xi)\psi(P), \qquad (4.28) \\
V_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x)\psi(P) =& i\xi^{-2n_-}y(P)\psi(P), \qquad (4.29) \\
\psi_{t_{\underline{r}}}(P) =& \widetilde{V}_{t_{\underline{r}}}(\xi)\psi(P). \qquad (4.30)
\end{aligned}$$

and one derives

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) = \sqrt{\frac{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})}}\exp\Big(\int_{t_{0,\underline{r}}}^{t_{\underline{r}}} ds\Big(\frac{i\xi^{2n_-}y\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x_0,s)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x_0,s)}\Big) - \int_{x_0}^{x} dx'\Big(\frac{q_x(x')\xi^{-2n_-+1}y(P)}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x')}\Big)\Big), \qquad (4.31)$$

and

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}})\psi_1(P^*,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) = \frac{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})}, \qquad (4.32)$$

$$\psi_2(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}})\psi_2(P^*,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) = \frac{H_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})}, \qquad (4.33)$$

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}})\psi_2(P^*,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) + \psi_1(P^*,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}})\psi_2(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) = \frac{2iG_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x,t_{\underline{r}})}{F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})}. \qquad (4.34)$$

In addition, as long as the zeros of $F_{\underline{r}}(\cdot,x,t_{\underline{r}})$ are all simple for $(x,t_{\underline{r}}) \in \Omega, \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ open and connected, $\psi(P,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}})$ is meromorphic on $\mathcal{K}_n \backslash \{P_{0,\pm}\}$ for $(x,t_{\underline{r}}),(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}}) \in \Omega$.

Proof. Equation (4.22), (4.25)-(4.27), (4.32)-(4.34) are proved as in Lemma 3.1. To prove (4.23) and (4.24) one first observes that

$$(\partial_x - 2iz + 2q_x\xi\phi - \frac{q_{xx}}{q_x})\Big((q_x\phi)_{t_r} + \xi^{-1}(\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}\phi - i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}})_x\Big) = 0 \qquad (4.35)$$

using (4.22) and relations (4.12) repeatedly. Thus,

$$(q_x\phi)_{t_r} + \xi^{-1}(\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}\phi - i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}})_x = C\exp\left(\int_{x_0}^{x} dx'(2iz - 2q_x\xi\phi + \frac{q_{xx}}{q_x})\right), \qquad (4.36)$$

where the left-hand side is meromorphic in a neighborhood of $P_{\infty+}$, while the right-hand side is not meromorphic near $P_{\infty+}$ only if $C = 0$. This proves (4.23). Equation (4.24) is an immediate consequence of (4.12) and (4.23). Relations (4.28)-(4.30) are clear from (4.20), (4.21), (4.22) and (4.24). (4.31) follows by (4.12), (4.18), (4.20) and (4.39). That $\psi_1(\cdot,x,x_0,t_r,t_{0,r})$ is meromorphic on $\mathcal{K}_n \backslash \{P_{0,\pm}\}$ if $F_{\underline{n}}(\cdot,x,t_r)$ has only simple zeros is a consequence of

$$-iz + q_x\xi\phi(P,x',t_r) \underset{P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x',t_{\underline{r}})}{=} \partial_{x'}\ln(F_{\underline{n}}(\xi,x',t_{\underline{r}})) + O(1) \qquad (4.37)$$

as $\xi \to \mu_j(x', t_{\underline{r}})$, using (4.12), (4.16) and (4.18) and

$$-\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(\xi, x_0, s)\phi(P, x_0, s) \underset{P \to \hat{\mu}_j(x_0,s)}{=} \partial_s \ln(F_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x_0, s)) + O(1), \tag{4.38}$$

using (4.12), (4.16) and (4.39). This follows from (4.20) by restricting P to a sufficiently small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_j(x_0)$ of $\{\hat{\mu}_j(x_0, s) \in \mathcal{K}_n | (x_0, s) \in \Omega, s \in [t_{0,\underline{r}}, t_{\underline{r}}]\}$ such that $\hat{\mu}_k(n_0, s) \in \mathcal{U}_j(x_0)$ for all $s \in [t_{0,\underline{r}}, t_{\underline{r}}]$ and for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \backslash \{j\}$ and by simultaneously restricting P to a sufficiently small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_j(t_{\underline{r}})$ of $\{\hat{\mu}_j(x', t_{\underline{r}}) \in \mathcal{K}_n | (x', t_{\underline{r}}) \in \Omega, x' \in [x_0, x]\}$ such that $\hat{\mu}_k(x', t_{\underline{r}}) \notin \mathcal{U}_j(t_{\underline{r}})$ for all $x' \in [x_0, x]$ and all $k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \backslash \{j\}$. ☐

Next we consider the $t_{\underline{r}}$-dependence of $F_{\underline{n}}, G_{\underline{n}}, H_{\underline{n}}$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume* (2.2) *and suppose that* (4.3), (4.4) *hold. Then*

$$F_{\underline{n},t_{\underline{r}}} = 2i(\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}} F_{\underline{n}} - G_{\underline{n}} \widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}), \tag{4.39}$$

$$G_{\underline{n},t_{\underline{r}}} = i(\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}} H_{\underline{n}} - F_{\underline{n}} \widetilde{H}_{\underline{r}}), \tag{4.40}$$

$$H_{\underline{n},t_{\underline{r}}} = 2i(G_{\underline{n}} \widetilde{H}_{\underline{r}} - \widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}} H_{\underline{n}}). \tag{4.41}$$

In addition, (4.39)-(4.41) *are equivalent to*

$$-V_{\underline{n},t_{\underline{r}}} + [\widetilde{V}_{\underline{r}}, V_{\underline{n}}] = 0, \tag{4.42}$$

and hence (4.14) *holds.*

Proof. We proves (4.39) by using (4.27) which shows that

$$(\phi(P) - \phi(P^*))_{t_{\underline{r}}} = \frac{2i\xi^{-2n-} y F_{\underline{n},t_{\underline{r}}}}{F_{\underline{n}}^2}. \tag{4.43}$$

However, the left-hand side of (4.43) also equals

$$(\phi(P) - \phi(P^*))_{t_{\underline{r}}} = \frac{2i\xi^{-2n-} y}{F_{\underline{n}}} (2i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}} - \frac{2i\widetilde{F} G_{\underline{n}}}{F_{\underline{n}}}), \tag{4.44}$$

using (4.24), (4.26) and (4.27). Combing (4.43) and (4.44) proves (4.39). Similarly, starting from (4.26)

$$(\phi(P) + \phi(P^*))_{t_{\underline{r}}} = 2iF_{\underline{n}}^{-2}(G_{\underline{n},t_{\underline{r}}} F_{\underline{n}} - F_{\underline{n},t_{\underline{r}}} G_{\underline{n}}) \tag{4.45}$$

yields (4.40). (4.41) is a consequence of (4.12), (4.39) and (4.40). Finally, differentiating $G_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x, t_{\underline{r}})^2 + F_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x, t_{\underline{r}}) H_{\underline{n}}(\xi, x, t_{\underline{r}})$ with respect to $t_{\underline{r}}$, and using (4.39)-(4.41) then yields $R_{\underline{n},t_{\underline{r}}} = 0$, or equivalently, (4.14). ☐

Next we turn to the Dubrovin-type equations, which governs the dynamics of of μ_j and ν_j with respect to variations of x and $t_{\underline{r}}$.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose* (2.2), (4.3), (4.4) *on an open and connected interval* $\widetilde{\Omega}_\mu \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$. *Suppose that the zeros* $\{\mu_j(\cdot)\}_{j=0,\ldots,n}$ *of* $\xi^{2n_- -1}F_{\underline{n}}(\cdot)$ *remain distinct and nonzero on* $\widetilde{\Omega}_\mu$. *Then* $\{\hat{\mu}_j(x)\}_{j=0,\ldots,n}$ *defined by* (4.16)*, satisfies the following first-order system of differential equations*

$$\mu_{j,x}(x,t_{\underline{r}}) = \frac{-2iy(\hat{\mu}_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}))}{\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\mu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})-\mu_k(x,t_{\underline{r}}))}, \tag{4.46}$$

$$\mu_{j,t_{\underline{r}}}(x,t_{\underline{r}}) = \frac{-2iy(\hat{\mu}_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}))\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(\mu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}))}{q_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})\mu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\mu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})-\mu_k(x,t_{\underline{r}}))},$$
$$j=1,\ldots,n,\ (x,t_{\underline{r}})\in\widetilde{\Omega}_\mu. \tag{4.47}$$

Next, assume $\mathcal{K}_n$ *to be nonsingular and introduce initial condition*

$$\{\hat{\mu}_j(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})\}_{j=1,\ldots,n} \subset \mathcal{K}_n \tag{4.48}$$

for some $(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})\in\mathbb{R}^2$, *where* $\mu_j(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})\neq 0, j=1,\ldots,n$, *are assumed to be distinct. Then there exists an open interval* $\Omega_\mu \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, *with* $x_0 \in \Omega_\mu$, *such that the initial value problem* (4.46-(4.48) *has a unique solution* $\{\hat{\mu}_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,n}\subset\mathcal{K}_n$ *satisfying*

$$\hat{\mu}_j \in C^\infty(\Omega_\mu,\mathcal{K}_n), \quad j=0,\ldots,n, \tag{4.49}$$

and $\mu_j, j=1,\ldots,n$, *remain distinct and nonzero on* Ω_μ.
For the zeros $\{\nu_j(\cdot)\}_{j=1,\ldots,n}$ *of* $\xi^{2n_- -1}H_{\underline{n}}(\cdot)$ *similar statements hold with* μ_j *and* Ω_μ *replaced by* ν_j *and* Ω_ν, *etc. In particular,* $\{\hat{\nu}_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,n}$, *defined by* (4.17)*, satisfies the system*

$$\nu_{j,x}(x,t_{\underline{r}}) = \frac{-2iy(\hat{\mu}_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}))}{\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\nu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})-\nu_k(x,t_{\underline{r}}))}, \tag{4.50}$$

$$\nu_{j,x}(x,t_{\underline{r}}) = \frac{2iy(\hat{\nu}_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}))\widetilde{H}_{\underline{n}}(\nu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}))}{r_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})\nu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\nu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})-\nu_k(x,t_{\underline{r}}))},$$
$$j=1,\ldots,n,\ x\in\Omega_\nu. \tag{4.51}$$

Proof. It suffices to prove (4.47) since the argument for (4.50) is analogous and that for (4.46) and (4.51) has been given in the proof of Lemma 3.2. Inserting $\xi=\mu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})$ into (4.39), observing (4.16), yields

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\underline{n},t_{\underline{r}}}(\mu_j) &= -q_x\mu_j^{-2n_-+1}\mu_{j,x}\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\mu_j-\mu_k) = -2iG_{\underline{n}}(\mu_j)\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(\mu_j), \\ &= 2i\xi^{-2n_-}y(\hat{\mu}_j)\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(\mu_j). \end{aligned} \tag{4.52}$$

which indicates (4.47). ☐

Since the stationary trace formulas for $f_{\ell,\pm}$ and $h_{\ell,\pm}$ in terms of symmetric functions of the zeros μ_j and ν_ℓ of $(\cdot)^{2n_- -1}F_{\underline{n}}(\cdot)$ and $(\cdot)^{2n_- -1}H_{\underline{n}}(\cdot)$ in Lemma 3.2 extend line by line to the corresponding time-dependent setting, we next record their $t_{\underline{r}}$-dependent analogs without proof. For simplicity we again confine ourselves to the simplest cases only.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume hypothesis* (2.2) *and suppose that* (4.3) *and* (4.4) *hold. Then,*

$$\frac{q_{xx}}{2iq_x} - \frac{1}{2}q_x r_x - c_{1,+} = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j, \tag{4.53}$$

$$\frac{r_{xx}}{2ir_x} + \frac{1}{2}q_x r_x + c_{1,+} = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} \nu_j, \tag{4.54}$$

$$\frac{iq}{2q_x} = (-1)^n \prod_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j, \tag{4.55}$$

$$\frac{ir}{2r_x} = (-1)^{n-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \nu_j. \tag{4.56}$$

Next we turn to the asymptotic expansions of ϕ and ψ in a neighborhood of $P_{\infty\pm}$ and $P_{0,\pm}$.

Lemma 4.5. *Assume hypothesis* (2.2) *and suppose that* (4.3) *and* (4.4) *hold. Moreover, let* $P = (\xi, y) \in \mathcal{K}_n \backslash \{P_{\infty\pm}, P_{0,\pm}\}$, $(x, t_{\underline{r}}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $(x, x_0, t_{0,\underline{r}}, t_{\underline{r}}) \in$

$\mathbb{R}^4$. *Then*

$$\phi(P,x,t_{\underline{r}}) \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \begin{cases} 2i[q_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})]^{-1}\zeta^{-1}+O(\zeta), & P\to P_{\infty+}, \\ [ir_x(x,t_{\underline{r}})/2]\,\zeta+O(\zeta^3), & P\to P_{\infty-}, \end{cases} \tag{4.57}$$

$$\phi(P,x,t_{\underline{r}}) \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \begin{cases} q(x,t_{\underline{r}})^{-1}\zeta^{-1}+O(\zeta), & P\to P_{0,+}, \\ r(x,t_{\underline{r}})\,\zeta+O(\zeta^3), & P\to P_{0,-}, \end{cases} \tag{4.58}$$

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \begin{cases} e^{i(x-x_0)\zeta^{-2}+i(t_{\underline{r}}-t_{0,\underline{r}})\sum_{s=1}^{r_+}\tilde{c}_{r_+-s}\zeta^{-2s}+O(1)}, & P\to P_{\infty+}, \\ e^{-i(x-x_0)\zeta^{-2}-i(t_{\underline{r}}-t_{0,\underline{r}})\sum_{s=1}^{r_+}\tilde{c}_{r_+-s}\zeta^{-2s}+O(1)}, & P\to P_{\infty-}, \end{cases} \tag{4.59}$$

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \begin{cases} \frac{q(x,t_{\underline{r}})}{q(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})}(1+O(\zeta))e^{i(t_{\underline{r}}-t_{0,\underline{r}})\sum_{s=1}^{r_-}\tilde{c}_{r_--s}\zeta^{-2s}}, & P\to P_{0,+}, \\ (1+O(\zeta))e^{-i(t_{\underline{r}}-t_{0,\underline{r}})\sum_{s=1}^{r_-}\tilde{c}_{r_--s}\zeta^{-2s}}, & P\to P_{0,-}, \end{cases} \tag{4.60}$$

with the local coordinates $\zeta=\xi^{-1}$ *near* $P_{\infty\pm}$ *and* $\zeta=\xi$ *near* $P_{0,\pm}$.

Proof. Since by the definition of ϕ in (4.18) the time parameter can be viewed as an additional but fixed parameter, the asymptotic behavior of ϕ remains the same as in Lemma 3.1. Similarly, also the asymptotic behavior of $\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{\underline{r}})$ is derived in an identical fashion to that in Lemma 3.1. This proves (4.59) and (4.60) for $t_{0,\underline{r}}=t_{\underline{r}}$, that is,

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{\underline{r}}) \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \begin{cases} e^{i(x-x_0)\zeta^{-2}+O(1)}, & P\to P_{\infty+}, \\ e^{-i(x-x_0)\zeta^{-2}+O(1)}, & P\to P_{\infty-}, \end{cases}$$

$$\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{\underline{r}}) \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \begin{cases} \frac{q(x,t_{\underline{r}})}{q(x_0,t_{\underline{r}})}(1+O(\zeta)), & P\to P_{0,+}, \\ 1+O(\zeta), & P\to P_{0,-}. \end{cases}$$

It remains to investigate

$$\psi_1(P,x_0,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}})=\exp\Big(\int_{t_{0,\underline{r}}}^{t_{\underline{r}}}ds(i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x_0,s)-\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x_0,s)\phi(P,x_0,s))\Big). \tag{4.61}$$

Next we compute the asymptotic expansions of the integrand in (4.61). Focusing on the homogeneous coefficients first, and then using the relations

$$\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}} \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \sum_{s=1}^{r_+}\tilde{c}_{r_+-s}\widehat{F}_{s,+}+O(1), \quad \widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}} \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \sum_{s=1}^{r_+}\tilde{c}_{r_+-s}\widehat{G}_{s,+}+O(1),$$

one finds as $P \to P_{\infty\pm}$,

$$\begin{aligned} i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}} - \widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}\phi &= i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}} + \widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}} F_{\underline{n}}^{-1}(i\xi^{-2n_-}y - iG_{\underline{n}}) \\ &\underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \frac{F_{\underline{n},t_r}}{2F_{\underline{n}}} + \frac{i\xi^{-2n_-}y\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}}{F_{\underline{n}}} \\ &\underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \pm i\sum_{s=1}^{r_+}\tilde{c}_{r_+-s}\zeta^{-2s} + O(1). \quad \zeta = 1/\xi. \end{aligned} \tag{4.62}$$

Insertion of (4.62) into (4.61) then proves (4.59) as $P \to P_{\infty\pm}$. Similarly, as $P \to P_{0,\pm}$,

$$\begin{aligned} i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}} - \widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}\phi &= i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}} + \widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}} F_{\underline{n}}^{-1}(i\xi^{-2n_-}y - iG_{\underline{n}}) \\ &\underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} i\widetilde{G}_{\underline{r}} + \widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(i - iG_{\underline{n}}\xi^{-2n_-}y)(F_{\underline{n}}\xi^{-2n_-}y)^{-1} \\ &\underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} \pm i\sum_{s=1}^{r_-}\tilde{c}_{r_--s}\zeta^{-2s} + \begin{cases} \frac{q_{t_{\underline{r}}}}{q} + O(1), & P \to P_{0,+}, \\ O(\zeta) & P \to P_{0,-}, \end{cases} \quad \zeta = \xi. \end{aligned} \tag{4.63}$$

Insertion of (4.63) into (4.61) then proves (4.60) as $P \to P_{0,\pm}$. $\square$

Next, we turn to the principal result of this section, the representation of ϕ, ψ_1, q, r in terms of Riemann theta function associated with $\mathcal{K}_n$, assuming $\underline{n} = (n_-, n_+) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \backslash \{(0,0)\}$ for the remainder of this section. In addition to (3.55) and (3.58), let $\Omega^{(2)}_{P_{\infty\pm},k}$ and $\Omega^{(2)}_{P_{0,\pm},k}$ be the normalized differentials of the second kind with a unique pole at $P_{\infty\pm}$ and $P_{0,\pm}$, respectively, and principal parts

$$\Omega^{(2)}_{P_{\infty\pm},k} \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} (\zeta^{-2-k} + O(1))d\zeta, \ P \to P_{\infty\pm}, \ \zeta = \xi^{-1}, \ k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{4.64}$$

$$\Omega^{(2)}_{P_{0,\pm},k} \underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} (\zeta^{-2-k} + O(1))d\zeta, \ P \to P_{0,\pm}, \ \zeta = \xi^{-1}, \ k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{4.65}$$

with vanishing a-periods,

$$\int_{a_j} \Omega^{(2)}_{P_{\infty\pm},k} = \int_{a_j} \Omega^{(2)}_{P_{0,\pm},k} = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Moreover, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Omega}^{(2)}_{\underline{r}} =& \Big(\sum_{s=1}^{r_-} 2s\tilde{c}_{r_--s,-}(\Omega^{(2)}_{P_{0,+},2s-1} - \Omega^{(2)}_{P_{0,-},2s-1}) \\ &+ \sum_{s=1}^{r_+} 2s\tilde{c}_{r_+-s,+}(\Omega^{(2)}_{P_{\infty+},2s-1} - \Omega^{(2)}_{P_{\infty-},2s-1}) \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{4.66}$$

and abbreviate

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{\infty\pm} = \lim_{P\to P_{\infty\pm}} \Big(\int_{Q_0}^{P} \widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{(2)} \mp \sum_{s=1}^{r_+} \tilde{c}_{r_+ - s}\zeta^{-2s} \Big), \tag{4.67}$$

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{0,\pm} = \lim_{P\to P_{0,\pm}} \Big(\int_{Q_0}^{P} \widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{(2)} \mp \sum_{s=1}^{r_-} \tilde{c}_{r_- - s}\zeta^{-2s} \Big). \tag{4.68}$$

The vector of b-periods of $\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{(2)}$ is denoted by

$$\underline{\widetilde{U}}_{\underline{r}}^{(2)} = (\underline{\widetilde{U}}_{\underline{r},1}^{(2)}, \dots, \underline{\widetilde{U}}_{\underline{r},n}^{(2)}), \quad \underline{\widetilde{U}}_{\underline{r},j}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{b_j} \widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{0,\pm}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \tag{4.69}$$

Theorem 4.6. *Assume* (2.2) *and suppose that* (4.3) *and* (4.4) *hold subject to the constraint* (3.2) *on* Ω*, where* $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ *is open and connected. In addition, let* $P \in \mathcal{K}_n \backslash \{P_{\infty\pm}, P_{0,\pm}\}$*,* $(x, t_{\underline{r}}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ *and* $(x, x_0, t_{\underline{r}}, t_{0,\underline{r}}) \in \mathbb{R}^4$*. Moreover, suppose that* $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})}$*, or equivalently,* $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})}$*, is nonspecial for* $(x, t_{\underline{r}}) \in \Omega$*. Then* ϕ, ψ_1, q, r *admit the following representations*

$$\phi(P, x, t_{\underline{r}}) = C(x, t_{\underline{r}}) \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P, \underline{\hat{\nu}}(x, t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P, \underline{\hat{\mu}}(x, t_{\underline{r}})))} \exp\left(\int_{Q_0}^{P} \Omega_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}}^{(3)} \right), \tag{4.70}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_1(P, x, x_0, t_{\underline{r}}, t_{0,\underline{r}}) = C(x, x_0, t_{\underline{r}}, t_{0,\underline{r}}) &\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P, \underline{\hat{\mu}}(x, t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P, \underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0, t_{0,\underline{r}})))} \\ &\times \exp\Big(-i(x - x_0)\int_{Q_0}^{P} \Omega_0^{(2)} - i(t_{\underline{r}} - t_{0,\underline{r}}) \int_{Q_0}^{P} \widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{(2)} \Big),\end{aligned} \tag{4.71}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}C(x, t_{\underline{r}}) = &\frac{1}{q(x_0, t_{0,\underline{r}})} \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-}, \underline{\hat{\mu}}(x, t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-}, \underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0, t_{0,\underline{r}})))} \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+}, \underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0, t_{0,\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+}, \underline{\hat{\nu}}(x, t_{\underline{r}})))} \\ &\times e^{-i(x-x_0)(e_{0,-} - e_{0,+}) - i(t_{\underline{r}} - t_{0,\underline{r}})\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{0,-} - \omega_0^{0,+}},\end{aligned} \tag{4.72}$$

$$C(x, x_0, t_{\underline{r}}, t_{0,\underline{r}}) = \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-}, \underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0, t_{0,\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-}, \underline{\hat{\mu}}(x, t_{\underline{r}})))} e^{i(x-x_0)e_{0,-} + i(t_{\underline{r}} - t_{0,\underline{r}})\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{0,-}}. \tag{4.73}$$

The Abel map linearizes the auxiliary divisors $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})}, \mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})}$ *in the sense that*

$$\underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})}) = \underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})}) - i\underline{U}_0^{(2)}(x - x_0) - i\underline{\widetilde{U}}_{\underline{r}}^{(2)}(t - t_{0,\underline{r}}), \tag{4.74}$$

$$\underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})}) = \underline{\alpha}_{Q_0}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})}) - i\underline{U}_0^{(2)}(x - x_0) - i\underline{\widetilde{U}}_{\underline{r}}^{(2)}(t - t_{0,\underline{r}}). \tag{4.75}$$

Moreover, one derives

$$\begin{aligned} q(x,t_{\underline{r}}) &= q(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}}) \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))} \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})))} \\ &\quad \times e^{i(x-x_0)(e_{0,-}+e_{0,+})+i(t_{\underline{r}}-t_{0,\underline{r}})(\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{0,-}+\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{0,+})}, \qquad (4.76) \\ r(x,t_{\underline{r}}) &= r(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}}) \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})))} \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))} \\ &\quad \times e^{-i(x-x_0)(e_{0,-}-e_{0,+})-i(t_{\underline{r}}-t_{0,\underline{r}})(\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{0,-}+\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{0,+})}, \qquad (4.77) \\ q(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})r(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}}) &= \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})))} \frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})))} \\ &\quad \times e^{\omega_0^{0,-}-\omega_0^{0,+}}. \qquad (4.78) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. As in the corresponding stationary case we temporarily assume

$$\mu_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}) \neq \mu_{j'}(x,t_{\underline{r}}), \text{ for } j \neq j', \ (x,t_{\underline{r}}) \in \widetilde{\Omega} \qquad (4.79)$$

for appropriate $\widetilde{\Omega} \subseteq \Omega$ and define the right-hand side of (4.71) to be $\widetilde{\psi}_1$. We intend to prove $\widetilde{\psi}_1 = \psi_1$, where ψ_1 is given in (4.20). For that purpose we first investigate the local zeros and poles of ψ_1 and note

$$\begin{aligned} q_{x'}(x',t_{\underline{r}})\xi\phi(P,x',t_{\underline{r}}) &\underset{P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x',t_{\underline{r}})}{=} \frac{2iy(\hat{\mu}_j(x,t_{\underline{r}}))}{\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\mu_j(x',t_{\underline{r}})-\mu_k(x',t_{\underline{r}}))} \\ &\qquad\qquad \times \frac{1}{\xi-\mu_j(x',t_{\underline{r}})} + O(1) \\ &\underset{P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x',t_{\underline{r}})}{=} \partial_{x'} \ln(\xi-\mu_j(x',t_{\underline{r}})) + O(1). \qquad (4.80) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} -\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(\xi,x_0,s)\xi\phi(P,x_0,s) &\underset{P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x_0,s)}{=} \frac{2iy(\hat{\mu}_j(x_0,s))}{\prod_{k=1,k\neq j}^{n}(\mu_j(x_0,s)-\mu_k(x_0,s))} \\ &\qquad\qquad \times \frac{1}{\xi-\mu_j(x_0,s)} \times \frac{\widetilde{F}_{\underline{r}}(x_0,s)}{q_x(x_0,s)} + O(1) \\ &\underset{P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x_0,s)}{=} \partial_s \ln(\xi-\mu_j(x_0,s)) + O(1), \qquad (4.81) \end{aligned}$$

using (4.16), (4.18), (4.46) and (4.47). Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\psi_1(P,x,x_0,t_r,t_{0,\underline{r}})\\
&=\begin{cases}(\xi-\mu_j(x,t_r))O\left(1\right), & \text{as} \quad P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})\neq\hat{\mu}_j(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}}),\\ O\left(1\right), & \text{as} \quad P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x,t_{\underline{r}})=\hat{\mu}_j(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}}),\\ \left(\xi-\mu_j(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})\right)^{-1}O\left(1\right), & \text{as} \quad P\to\hat{\mu}_j(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})\neq\hat{\mu}_j(x,t_r),\end{cases}\\
&\hphantom{=} \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad P=(\xi,y)\in\mathcal{K}_n, \quad (4.82)
\end{aligned}
$$

with $O(1)\neq 0$ and hence ψ_1 and $\widetilde{\psi}_1$ have identical zeros and poles on $\mathcal{K}_n\backslash\{P_{\infty\pm},P_{0,\pm}\}$ which are all simple. It remain to study the behavior of ψ_1 near $P_{\infty\pm},P_{0,\pm}$. One infers from (4.59), (4.60), (4.71) that $\widetilde{\psi}_1$ and ψ_1 have the same essential singularities at $P_{\infty\pm},P_{0,\pm}$ and the Riemann-Roch-type uniqueness result [7] proves that ψ_1 and $\widetilde{\psi}$ coincide up to normalization. This proves (4.71) for some $C(x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}})\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$. The expression (4.19) for the divisor ϕ then yields

$$
\phi(P,x,t_{\underline{r}})= \ C(x,t_{\underline{r}})\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P,\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P,\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}\exp\left(\int_{Q_0}^{P}\Omega^{(3)}_{P_{0,-},P_{\infty+}}\right), \tag{4.83}
$$

where $C(x,t_{\underline{r}})$ is in dependent of $P\in\mathcal{K}_n$. Hence (4.58) implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{q(x,t_{\underline{r}})} &=C(x,t_{\underline{r}})\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}e^{\omega_0^{0,+}}, && (4.84)\\
r(x,t_{\underline{r}}) &=C(x,t_{\underline{r}})\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}e^{\omega_0^{0,-}}, && (4.85)\\
q(x,t_{\underline{r}})r(x,t_{\underline{r}}) &=\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}e^{\omega_0^{0,-}-\omega_0^{0,+}}. && (4.86)
\end{aligned}
$$

The asymptotic behavior (4.60) of ψ_1 near $P_{0,\pm}$ then yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\psi}_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) &\underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} C(x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}})\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,-},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})))} && (4.87)\\
&\quad\times e^{-i(x-x_0)e_{0,-}-i(t_{\underline{r}}-t_{0,\underline{r}})\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{0,-}}+O(\zeta) \quad \text{as} \quad P\to P_{0,-},\\
\widetilde{\psi}_1(P,x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}}) &\underset{\zeta\to 0}{=} C(x,x_0,t_{\underline{r}},t_{0,\underline{r}})\frac{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})))}{\theta(\underline{\xi}(P_{0,+},\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})))} && (4.88)\\
&\quad\times e^{i(x-x_0)e_{0,+}+i(t_{\underline{r}}-t_{0,\underline{r}})\widetilde{\Omega}_{\underline{r}}^{0,+}}+O(\zeta) \quad \text{as} \quad P\to P_{0,+}.
\end{aligned}
$$

A comparison of (4.60, (4.87) and (4.88) then yields (4.73) and (4.76). (4.72) follows from (4.76) and (4.84). (4.77) is a consequence of (4.72) and (4.85).

The linearization property of the Abel map in (4.74) and (4.75) a standard investigation of the differentials $\Omega_i(x, x_0, t_{\underline{r}}, t_{0,\underline{r}}) = d\ln(\psi_i(\cdot, x, x_0, t_{\underline{r}}, t_{0,\underline{r}}))$, $i = 1, 2$ (c.f. [23]). $\square$

5 N-Dark Solitons

In this section, we will link the algebro-geometric solutions of FL hierarchy derived in section 4 with the N-dark solitons through a limiting procedure.

It is known that the solutions obtained after degeneration of the hyperelliptic spectral curve depend on the ramification points of $\mathcal{K}_n$ and different choices may lead to different solutions such as solitons, cuspons or peakons, breathers, etc. in some other integrable models. To derive the N-dark solitons of FL hierarchy, we degenerate the hyperelliptic curve $\mathcal{K}_n$ of genus n into a genus zero algebraic curve by pinching all a_j-cycles of the associated Riemann surface (cf.[3]). We assume that the ramification points E_m are ordered according to

$$\mathrm{Re}(E_j) \leqslant \mathrm{Re}(E_k), \quad j < k, \quad j, k = 0, \dots, 2n+1,$$

and consider the limit

$$E_{2m-1}, E_{2m} \to \alpha_m, \quad m = 1, \dots, n+1, \tag{5.1}$$

where $\alpha_m \neq \alpha_k$ for $m \neq k$. Putting $E_0 = \beta, E_1 = -\beta$ with $\beta > 0$, one finds

$$\mathcal{K}_n \to \mathcal{K}_n^0 : y^2 = (\xi^2 - \beta^2) \prod_{j=1}^{n} (\xi - \alpha_j)^2, \tag{5.2}$$

where $\beta \neq \alpha_j, j = 1, \dots, n$. Then the holomorphic differentials ω_j (cf.(3.51)),

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_j &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} c_j(\ell) \xi^{\ell-1} \Big(\prod_{m=0}^{2n+1} (\xi - E_m) \Big)^{-1/2} \\ &\to \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} c_j(\ell) \xi^{\ell-1} \Big((\xi^2 - \beta^2) \prod_{m=1}^{n} (\xi - \alpha_m)^2 \Big)^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Using the normalization condition $\displaystyle\int_{a_k} \omega_j = \delta_{jk}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{a_k} \omega_j &\to \int_{a_k} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} c_j(\ell) \xi^{\ell-1} \Big(\sqrt{\xi^2 - \beta^2} \prod_{m=1}^{n} (\xi - \alpha_m) \Big)^{-1} \\ &= 2\pi i \varphi_j(\alpha_k) \Big(\sqrt{\alpha_k^2 - \beta^2} \prod_{m=1, m\neq k}^{n} (\alpha_k - \alpha_m) \Big)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

one concludes

$$\varphi_j(\alpha_k) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\delta_{j,k}\sqrt{\alpha_k^2 - \beta^2}\prod_{m=1,m\neq k}^{n}(\alpha_k - \alpha_m). \tag{5.5}$$

Here we employ the notation

$$\varphi_j(\xi) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} c_j(\ell)\xi^{\ell-1}.$$

Especially, one obtains

$$c_j(n) = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_k^2 - \beta^2}}{2\pi i}, \quad \varphi_j(\xi) = c_j(n)\prod_{m=1,m\neq j}^{n}(\xi - \alpha_m) \tag{5.6}$$

from (5.5). Then using (5.6), one finds

$$\omega_j \to \omega_j^0 = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_k^2 - \beta^2}}{2\pi i}\Big(\sqrt{\xi^2 - \beta^2}\prod_{m=1}^{n}(\xi - \alpha_m)\Big)^{-1}. \tag{5.7}$$

The elements of Riemann matrix $\tau = (\tau_{jk})$

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{jk} &= \int_{b_j}\omega_k = 2\int_{\alpha_j}^{\beta}\omega_k \\ &\to 2\int_{\alpha_j}^{\beta}\omega_k^0 = -\frac{1}{\pi i}\ln\frac{\eta_k - \eta_j}{\eta_k + \eta_j} \triangleq \tau_{jk}^0\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

with $\eta_k = (\alpha_k - \beta)^{1/2}(\alpha_k - \beta)^{-1/2}$. So for the diagonal elements of τ, $\mathrm{Re}(i\tau_{kk}) \to -\infty$ in the limit (5.1). Then one can rewrite the Riemann theta function (3.52) as

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(\underline{z}) &= \sum_{\underline{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^n}\exp\left(2\pi i\sum_{j=1}^{n}k_j z_j + 2\pi i\sum_{j<m}\tau_{jm}k_j k_m + \pi i\sum_{j=1}^{n}\tau_{jj}k_j^2\right) \\ &= \sum_{\underline{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^n}\exp\left(2\pi i\sum_{j=1}^{n}n_j\Big(z_j + \frac{1}{2}\tau_{jj}\Big) + 2\pi i\sum_{j<m}\tau_{jm}k_j k_m + \pi i\sum_{j=1}^{n}\tau_{jj}k_j(k_j - 1)\right) \\ &\sim \sum_{\underline{k}\in\{0,1\}^n}\exp\left(2\pi i\sum_{j=1}^{n}k_j\Big(z_j + \frac{1}{2}\tau_{jj}\Big) + 2\pi i\sum_{j<m}\tau_{jm}^0 k_j k_m\right), \quad \underline{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_n).\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

As described in section 4, we are interested in soliton solutions q, r of

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{FL}}_{\underline{n}}(q,r) = \begin{pmatrix} q_{xt_{\underline{r}}} + f_{r_+-1,+,x} - 2iq_x g_{r_-,-} + 2if_{r_--1,-} \\ r_{xt_{\underline{r}}} - h_{r_+-1,+,x} + 2ih_{r_--1,-} + 2ir_x g_{r_-,-} \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (5.10)$$

$$(q,r)|_{t_{\underline{r}}=t_{0,\underline{r}}} = (q^{(0)}, r^{(0)}), \quad (5.11)$$

$$\text{s-FL}_{\underline{n}}(q^{(0)}, r^{(0)}) = \begin{pmatrix} f_{n_+-1,+,x} - 2iq_x^{(0)} g_{n_-,-} + 2if_{n_--1,-} \\ -h_{n_+-1,+,x} + 2ih_{n_--1,-} + 2ir_x^{(0)} g_{n_-,-} \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (5.12)$$

with

$$q^{(0)}(x) = q(x_0) \frac{\det\left(\delta_{ik} + \frac{2\eta_j}{\eta_j+\eta_k} e^{\pi i(\Lambda_j^0(P_{0,+}) + \Lambda_k^0(P_{0,+}))}\right)}{\det\left(\delta_{ik} + \frac{2\eta_j}{\eta_j+\eta_k} e^{\pi i(\Lambda_j(P_{0,-}) + \Lambda_k(P_{0,-}))}\right)} e^{i(x-x_0)(e_{0,-}-e_{0,+})}, \quad (5.13)$$

$$r^{(0)}(x) = r(x_0) \frac{\det\left(\delta_{ik} + \frac{2\eta_j}{\eta_j+\eta_k} e^{\pi i(\Lambda_j^0(P_{0,+}) + \Lambda_k^0(P_{0,+}))}\right)}{\det\left(\delta_{ik} + \frac{2\eta_j}{\eta_j+\eta_k} e^{\pi i(\Lambda_j^0(P_{0,-}) + \Lambda_k^0(P_{0,-}))}\right)} e^{-i(x-x_0)(e_{0,-}-e_{0,+})}. \quad (5.14)$$

Here and thereafter, for $\forall P \in \mathcal{K}_n \backslash \{Q_0\}$ we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_j^0(P) = & -1/2 + \sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq j}^{n} \int_{a_\ell} \omega_\ell(P) \int_{Q_0}^{P} \omega_j + A_{Q_0,j}(P) \\ & - \alpha_{Q_0,j}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0)}) - iU_{0,j}^{(2)}(x-x_0), \\ \Lambda_j(P) = & -1/2 + \sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq j}^{n} \int_{a_\ell} \omega_\ell(P) \int_{Q_0}^{P} \omega_j + A_{Q_0,j}(P) \\ & - \alpha_{Q_0,j}(\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})}) - iU_{0,j}^{(2)}(x-x_0) - i\widetilde{U}_{\underline{r},j}^{(2)}(t_{\underline{r}} - t_{0,\underline{r}}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following result.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume* (2.1), (2.2) *and suppose that* (4.1) *and* (4.2) *hold with respect to the constraint* (3.2) *on* Ω, *where* $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ *is open and connected. Moreover, suppose that* $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\mu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})}$, *or equivalently,* $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{\hat{\nu}}(x,t_{\underline{r}})}$, *is nonspecial for* $(x, t_{\underline{r}}) \in \Omega$. *Then for the cauchy problem of FL hierarchy* (5.10)-

(5.14) *we obtain the following N-dark soliton solutions*

$$\begin{aligned}q(x,t_{\underline{r}}) =& q(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})\frac{\det(\delta_{ik}+\frac{2\eta_j}{\eta_j+\eta_k}e^{\pi i(\Lambda_j(P_{0,+})+\Lambda_j(P_{0,+}))})}{\det(\delta_{ik}+\frac{2\eta_j}{\eta_j+\eta_k}e^{\pi i(\Lambda_j(P_{0,-})+\Lambda_k(P_{0,-}))})}\\ &\times e^{i(x-x_0)(e_{0,-}-e_{0,+})+i(t_{\underline{r}}-t_{0,\underline{r}})(\widetilde{\Omega}^{0,-}_{\underline{r}}+\widetilde{\Omega}^{0,+}_{\underline{r}})}, \qquad (5.15)\\ r(x,t_{\underline{r}}) =& r(x_0,t_{0,\underline{r}})\frac{\det(\delta_{ik}+\frac{2\eta_j}{\eta_j+\eta_k}e^{\pi i(\Lambda_j(P_{0,+})+\Lambda_k(P_{0,+}))})}{\det(\delta_{ik}+\frac{2\eta_j}{\eta_j+\eta_k}e^{\pi i(\Lambda_j(P_{0,-})+\Lambda_k(P_{0,-}))})}\\ &\times e^{-i(x-x_0)(e_{0,-}-e_{0,+})-i(t_{\underline{r}}-t_{0,\underline{r}})(\widetilde{\Omega}^{0,-}_{\underline{r}}+\widetilde{\Omega}^{0,+}_{\underline{r}})}. \qquad (5.16)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. It suffices to consider the limit (5.1) of (4.76), (4.77). Using (5.9), the symmetric property $\theta(\underline{z})=\theta(-\underline{z})$ and the formula [24]

$$\sum_{\underline{k}\in\{0,1\}^n}\exp\left(2\pi i\sum_{j=1}^{n}k_jz_j+2\pi i\sum_{j<m}\tau^0_{jm}k_jk_m\right)=\det B,$$
$$B=(b_{ik})_{n\times n},\quad b_{ik}=\delta_{ik}+\frac{2\eta_i}{\eta_i+\eta_k}e^{\pi i(z_i+z_k)},$$

one concludes (5.15), (5.16). □

Remark 5.2. (*i*) *Taking fixed* $\underline{r}=(1,1)$ *and varying* $\underline{n}\in\mathbb{N}^2\backslash\{(0,0)\}$, *one finally derives the N-dark solutions of FL equation* (1.2). *This result is consistent with that of* [*25*].
(*ii*) *In Theorem 5.1, taking some fixed* $\underline{r}\in\mathbb{N}^2\backslash\{(0,0)\}$, *and varying* $\underline{n}\in\mathbb{N}^2\backslash\{(0,0)\}$, *we obtains the N-dark soliton solutions of the* $\underline{r}$*th equation in the FL hierarchy.*

Acknowledgments

The work described in this paper was supported by grants from the National Science Foundation of China (Project No.10971031;11271079;11075055), Doctoral Programs Foundation of the Ministry of Education of China, and the Shanghai Shuguang Tracking Project (project 08GG01).

References

[1] M. J. Ablowitz, D. J. Kaup, A. C. Newell and H. Segur, The inverse scattering transform-Fourier analysis for nonlinear problems, Stud.Appl.Math. 53, 249-315, (1974).

[2] M. S. Alber, F. Fedorov, N. Yu, Algebraic geometrical solutions for certain evolution equations and Hamiltionian flows on nonlinear subvarieties of generalized Jacobians, Inverse Problems, 17, 1017-1042, (2001).

[3] E. D. Belokolos, A. I. Bobenko, V.Z. Enolskii, A.R. Its, and V.B. Matveev, Algebro-Geometric Approach to Nonlinear Integrable Equations, Springer, Berlin, (1994).

[4] B. A. Dubrovin, Completely integrable Hamiltonian systems associated with matrix operators and Abelian varieties, Funct. Anal. Appl. 11, 265-277, (1977).

[5] A. S. Fokas, On a class of physically important integrable equations, Physica. D. 87, 145-150, (1995).

[6] F. Gesztesy and R. Ratneseelan, An alternative approach to algebro-geometric solutions of the AKNS hierarchy, Rev. Math. Phys. 10 345–391 (1998).

[7] F. Gesztesy and H. Holden, Soliton Equations and their Algebro-Geometric Solutions, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2003).

[8] J. S. He, S. W. Xu, and K. Porsezian, Rogue Waves of the Fokas-Lenells Equation, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 81, 124007, (2012).

[9] Y. Hou, P. Zhao, E. G. Fan, Z. J. Qiao, Algebro-geometric solutions for the Degasperis-Procesi hierarchy, SIAM J. Math. Anal. in press.

[10] Y. Hou, E. G. Fan, P. Zhao, The algebro-geometric solutions for the Hunter-Saxton hierarchy, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. (to appear).

[11] A. R. Its, A. V. Rybin, and M. A. Sail, Exact integration of nolinear schrödinger equation, Thore. i. Mat. Fiz, 74, N.1, 29-45, (1988).

[12] A. Kundu, Two-fold integrable hierarchy of nonholonomic deformation of the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger and the Lenells-Fokas equation, J. Math. Phys. 51, 022901, (2010).

[13] A. Kundu, Integrable twofold hierarchy of perturbed equations and application to optical soliton dynamics, Theo. Math. Phys. 167, 800-810, (2011).

[14] C. Kalla, C. Klein, On the numerical evaluation of algebro-geometric solutions to integrable equations, Nonlinearity, 25, 569, (2012).

[15] I. M. Krichever, Integration of nonlinear equations by the methods of algebraic geometry, Funct.Anal.Appl. 11, 12-26, (1977).

[16] J. Lenells, Exactly solvable model for nonlinear pulse propagation in optical fibers, Stud. Appl. Math. 123, 215-232,(2009).

[17] J. Lenells, A. S. Fokas, On a novel integrable generalization of the nonlinear Schr$\ddot{o}$dinger equation, Nonlinearity. 22, 11-27, (2009).

[18] J. Lenells, Dressing for a novel integrable generalization of the nonlinear Schr$\ddot{o}$dinger Equation, J. Nonlinear. Sci. 20, 709-722, (2010).

[19] D. Mumford, Tata Lectures on Theta II, Birkh$\ddot{a}$user, Boston, (1984).

[20] Y. Matsuno, Multiperiodic and multisoliton solutions of a nonlocal nonlinear Schr$\ddot{o}$dinger equation for envelope waves, Psys. Lett. A, 278, 53, (2000).

[21] Y. Matsuno, A direct method of solution for the Fokas-Lenells derivative nonlinear Schr$\ddot{o}$dinger equation: I. Bright soliton solutions, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 45, 235202, (2011).

[22] Y. Matsuno, A direct method of solution for the Fokas-Lenells derivative nonlinear Schr$\ddot{o}$dinger equation: II. Dark soliton solutions, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 45, 475202, (2012).

[23] S. Novikov, S. V. Manakov, L. P. Pitaevskii, and V. E. Zakharov, Theory of soltions, Consultants Bureau, New York, (1984).

[24] E. Previato, Hyperelliptic curves and solitons, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard, (1983).

[25] V. E. Vekslerchik, Lattice representation and dark solitons of the Fokas-Lenells equation, Nonlinearity, 24, 1165-1175, (2011).

[26] O. C. Wright. III, Some homoclinic connections of a novel integrable generalized nonlinear Schr$\ddot{o}$dinger equation, Nonlinearity, 22, 2633-2643, (2009).